MEDIOCRIA.

BEING

A Collection of all that Mr. *Humfrey* hath Wrote

UPON THE

Great and Controverted

ARTICLE

OF

Juſtification:

CONTAINING

The ſeveral Books or Papers printed by *T. P.* concerning the Difference in *Doctrinals* among the *Nonconformiſts*; whereof this Great Article is Chief. Bound together with the *Letters* between the *Author* and Mr. *Clark*, for the *Finiſhing* their Doctrine in the *Middle Way* they go, upon that Subject.

By the aforeſaid Author.

Qui errare me exiſtimant, etiam utq; etiam diligenter qua ſunt dicta conſiderent, ne ipſi errent. Ego autem cum per eos qui meas labores legunt emendatior fio, propitium mihi Deum agnoſco, & hoc per Eccleſia, Doctores expecto, ſi dignentur noſſe quod ſcribo. Aug. De Bono Perſeverantiæ. C. 14.

LONDON: Printed for *T. Parkhurſt*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns* in *Cheapſide*, near *Mercers Chapel*. 1698.

970.02

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

These several Papers, upon the Subject or Subjects mentioned, have been those which have been for these three or four Years last published. I am sensible of the shortness of my Household-stuff, *yet am I willing, such as it is, to have it laid together: Especially that my Sheets called,* The Righteousness of God, *and the* Letters *between me and Mr.* Clark, *be conjoyned. I am indeed a* Person *in my* Genius *something peculiar, who make no Man my Master, and no Party on my side. I find little Appetite to print any Notion, though I agree in it with others, unless it first arise out of my own Thoughts: For I am perswaded, that let a Man put what flourish or colour he can on his Writings, there is a Sense and Discernment in the Judicious Reader, between an Original and Imitation. As also, that when it happens that any Notion*

or

or Notions, do light into the Pens of ſeveral Men together, ariſing purely out of their own Conceptions, it does bring a ſingular Confirmation to the Truth, as affording Strength in the Agreement, and a pleaſing Profit in the Variety of Explication.

What I have writ at firſt, and knew not any had ſaid it, and after find it ſaid by ſome other, (and it may be better and fuller) it is to me a memento *of Humility, that this is ſtill to be expected.* Nihil eſt jam dictum quod non fuit dictum prius.

The things I offer, I preſent as Rough-hewen, and moſt natural, but the fitter for others Art and Improvement. For the Words, or Stile, it is not for me to vye with the Youthful for Language: Neither are Controverſal Matters, where the Point is more dryly to be attended, fit for it. I know this is an Age that loves ſmoother Books, but I ſhall defend my ſelf with that of Cicero. Id maximè quemque decet, quod ſuum cujuſque eſt maximè.

J. H.

READER, In *Pacifi.* p. 35. l. 20. the word [*Not*] is left out. God does look, ſhould be, *God does not look.* —— Pray mend that one fault of the Printer, and excuſe many of mine.

MEDIOCRIA:

OR THE

Middle Way

BETWEEN

PROTESTANT and *PAPIST:*

In a PAPER of

JUSTIFICATION.

By *JOHN HUMFREY*

The Second Edition, with Additions, and a Letter to Mr. Williams.

Of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us, as if we had performed it all; and of Faith, whoſe office it is to embrace that Righteouſneſs ſo imputed, there is not one word in the Sacred Letters. *Grotius.*

I cannot but wiſh a Sounder Judgment to ſome who in theſe our times have troubled many with this paradox, that we are ſaved by Faith alone: when yet they ſaw this was ſo interpreted, as if they did define Righteouſneſs by the ſole opinion, or perſwaſion of the mind, and did ſeclude good Works. What Charity now is that which doth not vouchſafe one word to cure this Malady, by ſaying, We are Juſtified by Faith, formed, or conſummate; or by Faith, we attain a willingneſs to do good Works, and ſo attain unto Righteouſneſs, or Faith is the Foundation and Root of a good Life, as *Auſtin* ſaid? Nor is any Man verily to be offended with the truth. *Bucer.*

LONDON,

Printed for T. Parkhurſt, at the Bible and Three Crowns, in *Cheap-ſide*, 1695.

L 971.02

The *Bookſeller* to the *Reader*.

Reader,

THere was ſeveral Papers of Mr. *H.* Entituled, The Middle way (*or mediocria*) and one of the ſame nature called Peaceable Diſquiſitions, *which I printed long ſince, at ſeveral times*; *the firſt whereof*, was of Juſtification (*about a Year or two before any of the reſt*); *the Impreſſion whereof, going off wholly and quickly, I have been ſought to for that* Paper *often, but could gratifie no* Gentleman *or* Cuſtomer *with it, they being ſo long ſold: Knowing now, what a ſtir of late hath been, and is, made about this* Point, *and that Mr.* H. *did uſe another ſort of liberty of* Thought *than others do, in his writing of it; which liberty then was well taken, and no man offended, or writ againſt it* (*the* things *he offer'd, he* preſenting (*he ſaid*) by way of Eſſay, when a more accurate compoſure (*he judg'd*) would but take off from that which is native in them); *I have thought good, it being moved to me, to Reprint that Paper of* Juſtification, (*the firſt impreſſion being three or four and Twenty Years ago*) *and the rather, becauſe ſome Notions, which have ſpread abroad ſince in others books, do* (*it is ſuppoſed*) *owe their Original to* this Paper; *un-*

to

to which, you ſhall have the addition alſo of thoſe further Reflexions on the Point, *which he made in his others which enſued, as ſo many more blows on the ſame Iron while hot, being ſo hard to yield. I will preſume to ſay no more, but commit the Reader to the judgment hereupon of* two Men, *whoſe Teſtimony, while living, does beſpeak his more attentive reading and conſiderations.*

To Mr. *J. H.*

I Thank you for your Book. I think by ſtudying of the Scripture, and things more than what others have ſaid before you, you have eſcap'd the Temptations to ſiding and partiality: And I think you have hit on many conſiderable Truths, which many over-look; and improve many which ſome do lightly paſs over:

Richard Baxter.

I am of the ſame mind,

Tho. Manton. D. D.

Of *Juſtification.*

IT is a trouble to me often, in reading Polemical Divinity, to ſee how Men that *walk in a vain ſhew* to others, and *diſquiet themſelves in vain*, are governed by *Prejudice* and *Party:* It is a hard thing many times, and a Man muſt be very witty, and ſtrain himſelf to pick a fault in his Adverſary, *for matter of contention*, when a little pains only to underſtand him, and the leaſt candour, or, but a bare equality, in the interpretation, would bring him whether he would or no, almoſt, to *reconciliation*. The truth is, the Papiſts do abuſe the Proteſtants, and the Proteſtants abuſe the Papiſts, and that is the ſum of many of our great Controverſies. I judge the like between Arminian and Calviniſts, and other Contenders. If *Luther* hath ſaid it, or *Calvin* hath ſaid it, it muſt be *Heretical:* and if the Council of *Trent* have delivered it, or *Bellarmine* ſaid ſo, it muſt be *dangerous*, it ſavours of the *Harlot*, it is the *Abominable Doctrine of the Church of Rome*. Amongſt the many conteſts between this Church and us, there are few which are carried on with that affection and concernment, as the diſpute of Juſtification. St *Paul* was the firſt that engaged upon this point, and not without ſome warmth againſt thoſe that oppoſed him. St *James* is the next that hath ſpoken of this Subject. The Primitive Church and the Fathers after them have accorded pretty well with both; but the School-men, as I take it, by preſſing ſome paſſages of the Fathers over-cloſely, having obſcured the *grace of the Goſpel*, our Proteſtant Churches have riſen up as it were under the *ſtandard* of St *Paul*, that is *under his words*, and the Roman Church under the words of St *James*, and come out into a ſet Battle, which ſerving only to raiſe up *duſt*, *darkneſs* and *doubt* among the moſt, it is a *conference* I count between the *Leaders*, I mean a plain underſtanding or adjuſtment only of the *one* united certain ſenſe of *both Apoſtles*, inſpired by the ſame holy Spirit, that will, that muſt, and does give light to the intelligent and impartial, to uncloud the errors on each ſide, and end the quarrel.

The word *juſtify* is from the word *juſt*, and one may be ſaid

to be made or rendred juſt, by *infuſion*, or by *plea*. Our Proteſtant Divines do all teach us that the word is a forenſical term, and is to be underſtood in oppoſition to *Condemnation*, for which they have good Scripture; the Papiſts do tell us, that to juſtify a ſinner, is to make him righteous, and underſtand by it, in effect, the ſame thing with *Sanctification*. St *Auguſtine*, it muſt be acknowledged, hath lead them this way. *Gratificavit nos in dilecto, gratificavit a gratia, ſicut juſtificavit a juſtitia.* De bono perſeverantiæ, c. 6. *Chriſtus juſtificat impium faciendo ex impio Chriſtianum. Chriſt does juſtify the ungodly, by making him of one that is wicked, a holy man, or a Chriſtian*, Contra literas *Petiliani* l. 3. c. 45. There is his book *De ſpiritu & litera*, where he hath the ſame up, and from whence a Man may pick out his judgment on this point, rather than any where elſe that I know. I did expect to find more, *De fide & operibus*, but I perceive it does mainly reſpect another matter: we may ſee alſo his Book, *De libero arbitrio & gratia*. The judgment then of this Father which leads the Schools in their diſputes about theſe matters, as to the main, comes to this. That God of his own goodneſs only, or free will, to wit, according to Election, does vouchſafe the Holy Spirit to ſome Perſons, who does infuſe his Grace in their hearts; which Grace is that which diſpoſes them to all righteouſneſs, and is the ſame according to him, otherwhere with *Charity*, which fulfils the Law, and ſo juſtifies us. And in this ſenſe does he tell us, that, *Bona opera ſequuntur juſtificatum, non præcedunt juſtificandum. Good works do follow the Perſon juſtified, and do not go before juſtification.* The meaning whereof with him is, that we muſt firſt have this Grace infuſed (which habitually inclines to our whole duty both unto God and to our Neighbour), that is, the making the ungodly a juſt Man, before he can do any thing that is good. *Pelagius* Doctrine was, that Grace is given according to our Merits; but St *Auguſtines* Doctrine is, that Grace is firſt given, and good works follow.

When the Apoſtle then does tell us that we are juſtified by *grace*, this Father I ſay underſtands by it this infuſed grace, that is, an habit of righteouſneſs infuſed into the heart, for fulfilling the Law of God, and ſo juſtifies. *Lex data eſt ut quæreretur gratia, gratia data eſt, ut lex impleretur. The law is given that grace may be ſought, and grace is given that the law may be fulfilled.* De ſpir. & lit. c. 19. In correſpondence to this, when the Apoſtle ſays we are *juſtified by faith*, he tells us, that it is by its *impetration of this grace.*

grace. Impetrat orando, he has it in another place. Faith carries us to God, when we cannot fulfill his Commandments our ſelves, and by the infuſion of this habit he enables us to do it, and *thereby* are we juſtified in his Opinion. *Quod operum lex minando imperat, hoc fidei lex credendo impetrat. Lege operum dicit Deus fac quod jubeo: lege fidei dicitur Deo da quod jubes. That which the law of works requires by threats, the law of faith obtains by believing. In the law of works, God ſays, do what I command: in the law of faith, we ſay to God, give what thou commandeſt.* lb. c. 12. *Opus quod qui fecerit vivet in eo, non fit niſi juſtificato: juſtificatio autem ex fide impetratur. The works which he that does ſhall live in them, are not done but by the juſtified: and juſtification is impetrated by faith.* c. 19. *Lex non evacuatur ſed ſtatuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam qua lex impleatur. The law is not made void, but eſtabliſhed by faith, becauſe faith fetches from God his grace, whereby the law is fulfilled.* c. 30. Now when he accounts that this grace which makes us juſt, or this infuſed grace is obtained by faith, it is plain, that he muſt account that good works do follow it. Upon which there is a difficulty might be propoſed to this Father. The ſpirit infuſes this grace: does faith then precede the ſpirit that infuſes it, or not? If It do, then muſt our faith be of our ſelves, when our good works are of his gift. And this indeed was his judgment, while he wrote this book, tho after he recalled it in others. See particularly *De gra. & lib. arb. c.* 5. Where he is proving that our converſion, and ſo faith it ſelf is from God.

To go on, when the Apoſtle does oppoſe this *faith* and *grace* unto *works*, he is put to it; for, when by *grace* he underſtands nothing but infuſed righteouſneſs for the fulfilling the law, how does that oppoſe *works?* For the making his notion hold therefore, by works in oppoſition to grace and faith, he underſtands *Opera ſine adjutorio & dono Dei, works without the aſſiſtance and gift of God.* In ſhort, our juſtification is not of works, which are done before we have grace; but of works which proceed from it. *Iſrael non pervenit ad juſtitiam, quare? quia non ex fide ſed tanquam ex operibus: id eſt, tanquam eam per ſemet ipſos operantes, non in ſe credentes operari Deum. Iſrael attained not to righteouſneſs, why? becauſe he ſought it not of faith, but as it were of works: that is, as working it out of themſelves, and not believing in God to work it in them.* lb. c. 19. *So*, De gra. & lib. arb. c. 8. *Quomodo non ex operibus ne forte quis extollatur! audi & intellige, non ex operibus*

 dictum

dictum tanquam tuis ex te ipso tibi existentibus, sed tanquam his in quibus te Deus finxit. Ipsius enim figmentum sumus creati in Christo Jesu in operibus bonis. How, not of works that one may not boast? hear and understand, it is said not of works as thy own; done by thee of thy self: but of those as in which thou art created by God, for we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works. Again, *Ignorantes Dei justitiam, id est, quæ ex Deo est homini ut sit justus: & suam volentes constituere, tanquam per eorum non adjutam divinitus arbitrium lex possit impleri.* Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum. l. 3. c. 1. *Being ignorant of the righteousness of God, that is, which comes from God to man, to make him righteous; and being willing to establish their own, that is, as if by their own free-will without the divine help, they were able to perform the law.*

In this doctrine of the Father, there are three things wherein he is out.

The first is in his conception of *Grace*. When *works* and *grace* are opposed, we are not to apprehend with him, that *grace* is taken for any thing infused in the Soul, which is inherent grace; for *works* and *grace* in this sense have no opposition, the one being the fruits of the other. But by grace, we must understand the grace of God without us, the grace which is in God, that is, his favour, or the condescention of God to us in this matter. And thus is the opposition very plain. That which is of *debt* is one thing, and that which is of *favour* another. *Not of works*, that is, not of debt, or of what would make the reward to be due: *but of grace*, that is, when it is not due, but of favour. The certain truth is this, God Almighty gave to man a law according to his nature, which he repeated to the Jews, and if any man were able to keep this law according to the covenant of Nature, then should his justification be of *right* and *due*, according to the law of his creation; but the Apostle does most industriously prove, that neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* was able to produce these *works*, and consequently if there be any, whether *Jew* or *Gentile* that are justified, it must be by *grace*, because it cannot be of *right*, or what he may challenge by the law upon that account. Grace then, and mark it well, is the accepting of any mans person, or thing which is done, when one may choose, or when in justice one were not bound to do it. Accordingly, when God justifies us by grace, it is his accepting of us as righteous, or of what we do, for righteousness,

and

and rewarding it as ſuch, when according to his law it would not *ſtand*, but he might condemn us for it. Let any who have better words uſe them, I regard only my ſenſe. And here may we have an anſwer to a queſtion of great heat amongſt our Divines. The Goſpel requires Faith, Repentance, and new Obedience, and how then are we juſtified and ſaved by *grace*, or how then is grace *free*, when it is not vouchſafed but upon *conditions?* This difficulty hath made ſome run into that extream, that the Covenant of grace is without condition: but I ſay readily, the grace of God, or of the Goſpel is *free*, in that he accepts of the ſinners faith and repentance, when he needs not, or when according to the *Law*, he is not tyed to it, unleſs mans obedience were perfect. That which our Divines do offer uſually is this: It is free becauſe it is not of merit, mans belief and obedience cannot merit any thing at the hands of God, and much leſs Salvation, as well from the diſproportion of our performances, or momentary ſufferings, to the eternal weight of glory, with other the like reaſons, as that we do herein but our duty, and he helps us alſo in the doing, which are the chief reaſons that are urged.

This information does labour I think with ſome defect of light. If man had performed the condition of the Covenant of works, it might upon theſe reaſons have been ſaid, that life and ſalvation, had been ſtill of *grace* and *free*, as not merited, while theſe conſiderations hinder merit: whereas the Apoſtle induſtriouſly oppoſing the ſinners being juſtified, or ſaved freely by Gods grace, to juſtification by works, or the deeds of the law, does account, if man were juſtifyed by *works*, it would be of *debt*. Could a man (I ſay) have performed the condition of the Covenant of Nature, the Apoſtle accounts ſtill in his reckoning that then had the reward been of *debt* or *merit*, and if a mans own Conſcience could not accuſe him of ſin, he had no need of *grace*: but now ſayes he, ſeeing both *Jew* and *Gentile* fall ſhort hereof, and all are become guilty before God, there is none, is, or can be juſtified, but it muſt be *gratis*, *freely* in oppoſition to that performance. To lend more help againſt this difficulty we muſt diſtinguiſh of merit. There is a debt or merit of *Commutative* juſtice or of governing *Diſtributive* juſtice. It is impoſſible that any ſhould engage the Almighty in a debt of the former ſort. Of the latter ſort, there is a debt or merit upon *Compact*, or upon *ſtrict Retaliation*. It is true; that there is nothing man does, or could do in the ſtate of innocency, had

had he continued perfect, can merit, or could have merited any reward from God, upon the ſcore of a ſtrict *Retaliation*, any more than upon *Commutative* juſtice, there being nothing we do worthy our Governour, beſides we neither *benefit*, or *hurt* him: and ſo theſe reaſons before named of our Divines and others, may come in if they pleaſe. *Can a man be profitable to God*, ſayes *Eliphas* to *Job?* And, *who hath given to the Lord that he ſhould receive of him*, ſayes the Apoſtle? But the caſe is not ſo (under their favour) with a debt, or merit upon *Compact*. A compact then may be twofold. Upon terms that are *equal*: and upon terms *unequal*. In a compact upon terms that are equal, we are to know that the reward does become debt, or may be ſaid to be of merit, notwithſtanding by way of ſtrict retaliation, or upon an account of equal benefit, the performance of the condition would require no ſuch matter. For inſtance, if I agree to give a man half a crown for his dayes work, I muſt pay it him as *debt*, though the emolument to me by the work done, is not worth it, nay, though if I had not agreed, I ſhould have thought much to give him half the money: but in a compact upon terms *unequal*, as if I promiſe a poor man a ſhilling for his leading my horſe to the next ſtile, though I am bound to give it to him when he has done ſo, yet is the ſhilling an *Almes*, or the reward of *grace*, (or favour) for all that. Now I account when God in the covenant of Nature, hath made eternal life to be due upon exact obedience, it is a compact upon terms but *equal*, he that *doth them, ſhall live in them*. So long as man was innocent, God in juſtice could not puniſh him: and ſo long as he continued but in the ſame ſtate he was created, he muſt be *happy*, and *eternally* ſo, which is the ſame thing with *Salvation*, only it could not be called by that name, till man was firſt *loſt*. Neither may Gods giving him ability, or his doing no more than his duty, be any hindrance to him of meriting upon this compact, any more than my letting the man I have hired, to work with my ſhovel or mattock, and his doing only what he was bid, hinder him of his wages: the reaſon is, becauſe the compact ſuppoſes that if he does but his duty, with the ſtrength that God has given, or does give him, he ſhall be juſtified and bleſſed. If *Adam* then had, or we could perform the condition of *Nature*, which is to live perfectly without offending God at all, the reward no doubt (ſeeing the Apoſtle ſo accounts of it) ſhould be of *merit* or *debt*, for that was a covenant upon terms but *equal*, it being *meet* that God ſhould deal

benignly

benignly with us as his *Creatures*, while we carry our ſelves towards him as our *Maker*, and that he ſhould not deprive us of any benefit, to which we were *created*, before we forfeited it by our tranſgreſſion. But now when he gives us the reward, which is *eternal life through his Son*, upon an obedience which is imperfect (that is by a new Covenant upon terms *unequal*) he gives it *freely*, ſeeing he gives it without performance of the condition at firſt required to obtain the ſame. The ſum of this is, *the Rectoral* juſtice of God is either under the *ſtrict* law, or under the *law of grace*. When our Divines then ſay that our works do not merit, they ſay true, but they muſt be rightly underſtood: when they give us thoſe reaſons for it, at firſt named, their reaſons are good againſt all merit of *Commutative* juſtice, and of ſtrict retaliation in *Diſtributive* juſtice, and againſt merit *ex pacto* under the *ſtrict law*, or upon terms that are equal: but as to a merit of compact under the law of grace, *ſecundum regimen gratiæ paternum*, they are not good. When by ſome of theſe reaſons therefore, our works, if they were perfect ſhould not yet be meritorious, which is a contradiction to the Apoſtle, I muſt conclude that the reaſon why grace is ſaid to be *free* by St *Paul*, is not becauſe our works do not merit upon their reaſons, or do not merit with a merit of ſtrict *retaliation*, or *ex pacto*, upon terms that are *equal*, which their reaſons only exclude; but becauſe we do not come up to thoſe (thoſe works), which notwithſtanding their reaſons, would merit if we did perform them; that is, becauſe they come ſhort of that condition, which by Gods firſt compact according to *Nature*, ſhould make the reward to be of debt, and yet God accepts of them for Chriſts ſake, and rewards them no leſs than if they did. That the grace of juſtification is purchaſed by Chriſt, it is apparent in the words that are ordinarily joyned with it, *Being juſtified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus*. But if the notion of *free* did lye in the conception our Divines ordinarily frame, then could it not be the fruit of Chriſts purchaſe, for how can that which is *purchaſed*, in their ſenſe be *free?* whereas it is this grace certainly, is the main fruit of Chriſts redemption, to wit, that the new Covenant ſhould be eſtabliſhed, ſo as the poor ſinner, whoſe Conſcience does condemn him of the breach of that law, which is *written in his heart*, and according to which he ſhould dye, hath yet a refuge to Gods mercy, which he is ſaid, (I pray pardon me the repetition) to beſtow *freely*, becauſe man hath not the works

which

which ſhould make the reward due to him. Lo then how the grace of God is ſaid *free* indeed in the meaning of the Apoſtle. Not upon the account, I ſay, that man *cannot merit at Gods hand*, (though it be true that *our works do not merit*) as our Divines ordinarily only inform us, ſeeing both that God can be made debtor, *ex pacto*, *regimine gratiæ paterno*, and Chriſt who became man did merit for us: but upon the account here mentioned; which is a moſt direct anſwer to the doubt propoſed, how the grace of God can be free, which is not tendred and obtained but upon condition; and I declare that Gods abatement of the terms, and requiring a *new* condition is that which therefore makes it free, ſeeing it is tendred and obtained without performance of the *old*. As alſo that the new being *unequal*, hinders not *grace*.

The ſecond thing wherein St *Auſtin* is out, is in his interpretation of *Works*. It is manifeſt that *Paul* ſpeaks of works in ſuch a ſenſe, as no man living can perform them, and upon that account no man can be juſtified by them. But if the interpretation of this Father, and the Papiſts after him were true, that by works we muſt underſtand works only that are done before a man is regenerate, or before he hath the help of the ſpirit, then may a man who is regenerate, and hath its help, perform the works that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, and ſo be juſtified by them. And then muſt his doctrine be falſe that comes to this univerſal concluſion. *Wherefore we conclude that by the works of the law ſhall no fleſh living be juſtified in his ſight, for by the law is the knowledge of ſin.* On the other ſide, when ſome Proteſtants conceive that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of our works in general, and accounts that we are not juſtified by *them*, becauſe it is by the *righteouſneſs of Chriſt* that we are juſtified, I cannot but think they are out likewiſe. For if when *Paul* ſays we are not juſtified by *works*, his meaning were, not by our *own works*, but by the *obedience of Chriſt* wrought for us: then when *James* ſays we are juſtified by *works*, his meaning muſt be by the *works Chriſt did for us*, and he muſt not mean our *own*. But this is abſonant to any rational apprehenſion to conſtrue St *James* ſo. Nor do I think ſuch a meaning ever came into the heads of either of the Apoſtles. Our Divines then ſhould not ſay here of our works in general, but as to the ſenſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of them in general, we are not juſtified by them. And what is that ſenſe then in which he ſpeaks of *works*; why he ſpeaks of works in that ſenſe moſt manifeſtly as the *law* requires them, *that we may live in them.*

them. Let a man then have the help of the ſpirit, or be without it, ſo long as he falls ſhort of what the law requires at his hands, be it never ſo little, he cannot *live* by thoſe works; the curſe is due to him for the leaſt breach, and that is contrary to juſtification. There are ſome Divines of note therefore, ſeeing no footing for this diſtinction, have choſe an other. There are works of the *Law* (ſay they:) and works of the *Goſpel.* When St *Paul* ſayes we are not juſtified by *works*, he ſpeaks expreſly of *works of the Law:* St *James* is to be underſtood of the *works of the Goſpel.* This diſtinction may ſerve well, provided it to be cloathed with the ſenſe of the Apoſtles. When ſome have uſed theſe terms to ſignify no more but that we are not juſtifyed by Jewiſh obſervations, but by the righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, it falls too ſhort in the firſt branch to do any thing. But by the *works of the law* let them underſtand *works which anſwer the law*, and that there are none juſtified by the *works of the law*, becauſe there is none perfectly fulfil it, and they have hit the buſineſs. For though *Paul* ſpeaks not only of works by the law of innocency, but directly and moſtly of the works of the Jewiſh law, which the Jews fancied, *ex ſufficientia & præſtantia legis*, did as ſuch, procure pardon and life, without looking to the merits of the Mediator for it, and ſo erred: yet the law of *Moſes* conſiſting either in *moral* precepts that repreſented the law of Nature which no man can come up to, and the moſt righteous of them did break: or in the *remedying* commandements of ſacrifices or attonements for ſin, whoſe virtue alone did lye in the blood of the Redeemer: the ground & bottom of their errour which he confuteth does indeed lye herein; ſeeing that (*N. B.*) whatſoever it was they did, or whatſoever they thought of it, it did fall ſhort of the law of works, and therefore did not juſtify them before God. There are works then which if they be performed do *anſwer the Law*, the law we are to mean *ultimately* as given to mankind in a Covenant by our creation: and works which if performed do *not anſwer the Law*, but anſwer the *Goſpel.* If the diſtinction before-cited be received with this meaning, it is true that *Paul* ſpeaks of the works of the *Law*, and *James* of the works of the *Goſpel*; and that there is no man juſtified by the *former*, becauſe there is no man does or can perform them, when we do perform the *latter* and are juſtified by them. To give more light and weight to this. There are works which if we be juſtified by them exclude grace: and there are works which exclude not grace though we be juſtified by them. The works of the law, take

them in this ſenſe, that anſwer the law if they be performed, muſt make juſtification due ſo as it may be challenged according to the law; the reward ſhall be of debt, and there be no need of grace but juſtice in the caſe, for he that doth them ought of right to *live in them*. And theſe are the works undoubtedly that *Paul* diſputes againſt, while he proves juſtification to be of grace; which is alſo agreeable to the end and ſcope the holy Ghoſt ſeems to have in it, to wit, the beating man down from all vain exaltation in himſelf, and laying him at Gods feet for all he has. Wherein it were not yet enough that what he hath is received, ſeeing he would be even ready to boaſt of this, that he hath received what others have not: but that when he is enabled by God to perform that which he does, even this which he hath received, and is accepted, is but ſuch as God Almighty might chooſe whether he would accept it or not, and if it were not for *grace*, for all he hath done, he could not yet be juſtified and ſaved. On the contrary hand therefore, the works of the Goſpel, that is the works which the Goſpel requires of us as the condition of our juſtification and Salvation, ſuch as faith, repentance, and new obedience, when they are performed, and anſwer the *Goſpel*, they do yet ſtand in need of grace, becauſe they do not anſwer the *law*, and God might chuſe whether he would accept them or no, or make any promiſe to them. When we repent, it includes the acknowledgment of ſin, and when we believe, it is a flying to Gods mercy for it, and though we may walk *ſincerely* before God, we do not, and cannot walk *perfectly*, and he might condemn us in juſtice for the leaſt failings, and much more for our manifold tranſgreſſions. If God then ſhews mercy, and accepts of what we do, it muſt be of his grace that he does it. It is true that theſe works do juſtifie us, but that is while we are judged at the bar of Gods grace, or according to the new Covenant, which is therefore called a covenant of grace, or the law of grace, becauſe that grace is no wayes deſtroyed, but confirmed by theſe works. From whence it may appear that the two Apoſtles ſhall be ſo far from contradicting one another about this point, as that, what St *Paul* contends for, ſhall be made good by that which is ſaid by St *James*. *Paul* ſayes we are juſtified by grace, and St *James* proves it, while he ſhews us that our works which are *imperfect* (even ſuch as *Rahabs* as well as *Abrahams*) are accepted and rewarded as if they were *perfect*, that is, are *imputed* to us *for righteouſneſs*, which they could never be but for *grace*, and that purchaſed through the redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus.

The

The third thing wherein St *Auguſtine* miſtakes, is that which ſtrews the way to the Papiſts doctrine of juſtification by *works*: and therefore it will be neceſſary before I come to it, to advance here ſomething out of this Father which offers us I think ſome light towards the fixing our own doctrine of juſtification by *faith*. *Per legem cognitio peccati: per fidem impetratio gratiæ contra peccatum: per gratiam ſanatio animi a vitio peccati: per animi ſanitatem libertas arbitrii: per liberum arbitrium juſtitiæ dilectio: per juſtitiæ dilectionem legis impletio.* De ſpir. & lit. c. 30. *By the law we have the knowledge of ſin: by faith we impetrate Gods grace againſt ſin: by grace the Soul is healed from corruption: by that healing we have liberty of will: by this liberty we come to love righteouſneſs: by the love of righteouſneſs we perform or fulfil the law, and ſo are juſtified.* Faith then does juſtifie according to him, as *exordium hujus ad ſalutem connexionis* (ſo he expreſſes it c. 31.) as *the beginning work that brings on the reſt which follow in this connexion*, or as the foundation link in this chain of our ſalvation. That we may be ſure of his judgment herein, this muſt not go without ſome quotation from one of his latter books alſo. *Ex fide autem ideo dicit juſtificari hominem, non ex operibus, quia ipſa prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cætera, quæ proprie opera nuncupantur, in quibus juſte vivitur.* De prædſtinatione ſanctorum. l. 1. c. 7. *The Apoſtle ſaith a man is juſtified by faith and not by works, becauſe it is faith that is firſt given, from whence they follow, or by which the grace of God to lead a holy life is obtained.* And unto this will I add the ſuffrage yet of a greater Author, the Son of *Sirach*. *Faith is the beginning of cleaving to God.*

There may be here therefore two queſtions, *de fide, Quæ juſtificat*, and *qua juſtificat*. What faith it is that juſtifies us? and, how faith juſtifies us?

For the former it is agreed eaſily. That faith which *worketh by love*, as St *Paul* ſpeaks, or that faith which is *made perfect by works* as St *James* ſpeaks, and no other, is that which juſtifies us. There are ſome Divines make faith a complex thing to comprehend repentance and obedience under it. Faith, ſay they, is the receiving Chriſt both as Saviour and Lord, or the receiving him upon the terms of the Goſpel; and it is no wonder if they ſay faith alone juſtifies us, when this faith alone is no leſs with them than the whole condition which the Goſpel requires of us to our juſtification. Others do diſtinguiſh *faith, repentance*, and *obedience*,

and ſay, that it is not *faith* alone, but *repentance* and *new obedience* alſo is required to juſtifie us. And both theſe ſorts of Divines ſay but the ſame thing in effect, and agree in their meaning. When the Scripture therefore ſays, *If thou believeſt thou ſhalt be ſaved, or if thou repenteſt thou ſhalt be ſaved*; *Bellarmine* ſays ſuch Texts muſt be underſtood with the ſuppoſition, *ſi cætera adhibeantur*, that is, *if that which is required alſo elſewhere is ſupplied.* Thou ſhalt be ſaved if thou repenteſt, provided thou alſo believeſt; and if thou believeſt thou ſhalt be ſaved, provided alſo thou repenteſt and walkeſt ſincerely before God. I mean, provided thou reſolves upon a changed upright life, and if thou art not prevented, bringeſt this reſolution to practiſe, there being no doubt but if a man dye before opportunity, his conſent to the covenant is to be reckoned for obedience, and baptiſm always waſhes away ſins with the Fathers. *Non concluditur legitime* (ſays a Judicious Proteſtant Divine) *a poſitione unius diſparati ad negationem alterius: neque ab eo quod aliquot locis docetur, ad negationem eorum quæ alibi aſſeruntur. We may not argue from the poſition of one thing, to the negation of another which is but* diverſe, *and not* contrary *to it, nor from the aſſertion of one thing as ſome places of Scripture, to the denyal of any thing elſe which is aſſerted alſo in others.* And this I take to be more after St *Auſtin* and St *James*, who do both methinks make faith the *initium & fundamentum* (to uſe his words) the *foundation* and *entrance* to obedience and good works, and ſo to juſtifie us as it is productive of them. We ſhall reconcile all I hope if we ſay only, that faith indeed may be *diſtinguiſhed*, when not *divided* from our obedience in our juſtification. That is, in ſhort, *faith*, is one thing, and *juſtifying faith* is another, and yet juſtifying faith retain the common nature ſtill of *faith*. Juſtifying faith, I take it, is ſuch a believing of, or truſting to Gods mercy, that he will pardon our ſins if we repent and walk ſincerely before him (which are the terms obtained for us through Chriſts redemption), as produces that repentance and ſincere walking. It is ſuch an *aſſent* to what God reveals, as carries the *heart* and *life* along with it. I believe his *promiſes* (to wit effectually) when I ſo truſt them, as to do the things he requires of me to obtain them. I believe his *precepts* when I keep them. I believe his *threats*, when I abſtain from the evil he forbids, to avoid them. I believe the *Goſpel*, when I become Chriſts Diſciple. *Credere is fidelis eſſe* according to *Salvian*, & to be faith-

faithful, is to do our duty. *Well done good and faithful ſervant.*

For the latter, I do not apprehend ſeriouſly (if I may ſpeak freely my thoughts, to which very end do I write) but that there is a great deal more ſtir and difference among Divines in this point of *juſtification by faith* than needs in late times. If any man might meerly by his believing Chriſt dyed for him, and hath carried away all ſin, be juſtified and ſaved, let him live as he liſt holding ſtill but this perſwaſion, there were ſomething in our contending for juſtification by faith alone, and a man would not be bereaved of the comfort of ſuch a doctrine for the World. But when we all agree that whether good works do juſtify or no, good works in the *reſolution*, and *practice*, if not prevented, are neceſſary ſome way or other; ſo that no man living ever was, or can be juſtified that is deſtitute of them. I doubt me verily our contention in this matter is rather *curious* than *profitable*, in ſhewing how faith *without works*, but not a faith, *which is without works* (at leaſt in the will and intention) does juſtify. I know our Divines againſt the Papiſts contend that faith juſtifies *in ſenſu correlativo*, or in regard of the object, ſo as to be juſtified by Chriſts blood, and by faith is all one, that is, by faith in his blood. The righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed is the *formal*, ſay ſome, or as others had rather ſay, the *material* cauſe of our juſtification, and faith juſtifies as an inſtrument. For my own part I will tell you therefore what I have ſometimes ſet down for truth in my *contending belief*, and what I think in my cold *practical conceit* of the point.

As for my younger thoughts I have ſometimes pitched them thus. Juſtifying faith is the *receiving act* of a *working habit*, as hath the other act too to put forth upon trial, or elſe it is but a *dead* faith. Now this faith I have counted juſtifies as an *inſtrument*, not *mans*, who doth not juſtify himſelf, but *Gods* inſtrument though mans act. This I have made out to my ſelf thus. Unto juſtification there goes two things, the *imputation* of Chriſts righteouſneſs for the diſcharge of ſin, and accepting us unto life; and a *valid donation* of it to the ſinner. The laſt is the ground of the former; for man muſt be *made juſt*, or God cannot reckon him ſo, and acquit him in judgment. *The judgment of God is according to truth.* Now to this making a man juſt, as there is this *donation* of God, there muſt be mans *receiving*, Chriſt is not ours though tendered or given untill we receive him. This receiving then (which is our act, that is faith it ſelf) God excites, and make uſe of to this end. He

makes

makes uſe of it (I have accounted) as his inſtrument of making Chriſt ours, to this end he hath appointed it for, that he may accordingly reckon his righteouſneſs to us, unto the remiſſion of ſin and everlaſting ſalvation.

Having told you this firſt, I may make the bolder to tell you my more indifferent thoughts of farther years. I do apprehend that the Apoſtles in their doctrine, and the Primitive Chriſtians, had more ſimple and leſs intricate conceptions of things than we have; and that their diſpute then whether we are juſtified by faith or works, in the moſt ſimple underſtanding of it, contains no more than to ſhew us what is required of perſons that they may be juſtified, or what is that God hath made the condition on our parts of our juſtification. St *Auguſtine* I have ſaid, does teach us that faith does juſtify us as the beginning and foundation unto grace and a good life, and the Council of *Trent* with *Bellarmine*, and the Papiſts after that Council ſtand upon this. Faith juſtifies only as *initium juſtificationis*, the beginning of juſtification. But howſoever the Papiſts have made uſe of that Father, the truth and light which he hath offered, is not to be loſt; I do take this to be the moſt right and certain notion that faith does juſtify as *initium* and *fundamentum*; I will not ſay *juſtificationis*, ſeeing I underſtand not juſtification to be all one with ſanctification as they do, but as *fundamentum conditionis*. The condition of our full and final juſtification the Goſpel offers, is repentance and ſincere obedience, and faith is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of that condition. *Was not* Abraham *our Father juſtified by works when he had offered his Son* Iſaac, ſays St *James?* The faith of *Abraham* or his believing God, was the beginning and foundation of this excellent work, the ready offering his Son, which ſhewed his ſincerity of life, the condition of juſtification. *And the Scripture was fulfilled which ſaith* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs.* Here *believing* and *offering of Iſaac* are all one with St *James*. The offering *Iſaac* proceeded from believing, as the *initium* and *fundamentum* of it, and ſo believing as the *initium* of ſincerity of life or ſincere obedience does juſtifie. Such a faith as produces good works which are ſincere tho' imperfect, or ſuch good works as proceed from faith, are but one and the ſame thing with the two Apoſtles, and made by both, the condition of our juſtification.

And here I ſhould be willing to come off: but the uniform judgment of the reformed Churches on the Article of Juſtification requires

quires ſome regard. There is therefore in the Schools, a *Quatenus ſpecificative, & reduplicative.* I ſuppoſe when I have ſaid that faith does juſtify us as the foundation of the condition (and ſo productive of the whole of it) I have ſaid well with St *Auguſtine* as to the *quatenus ſpecificative*, and if I ſaid nothing elſe it might be enough. Nevertheleſs, ſeeing it is but fit upon this account to ſpeak yet a little more curiouſly, I muſt needs ſay farther, that I apprehend there is indeed ſomething really in that which lyes in the concurring thoughts of our Divines, that faith hath, and muſt have a hand in our juſtification ſome way, as no other of our works or acts have. It is this. I believe that God will pardon me if I repent, and therefore I repent, as my faith now makes me repent and perform the condition, it juſtifies me, as to a *quatenus ſpecificative*: but when I have repented and performed the condition, the duties I have performed are imperfect and ſinful, and have need of mercy in point of law, and it is my faith yet muſt go to God for his acceptance of them through Chriſt when I have done. It is my faith, let me ſay, that muſt make up to me, out of the mercy or grace of God for Chriſts ſake, what is wanting in that I have done to make it ſuch as he may impute it to me for righteouſneſs, which elſe he could not. And as faith procures me this, or procures it thus, we have the *quatenus* alſo *reduplicative*, in the great queſtion how faith juſtifies. It is faith makes me perform the condition, and then finds acceptance for it being done; and as it does both, it does *ſpecificative*, and *reduplicative* juſtify the ſinner. By this, it appears, how faith hath an eye ſtill to pardon according to the Proteſtant, while it is oppoſed to works in the point of juſtification, which is not only as reſpecting the pardon of all our ſins upon the performing the condition: but as reſpecting that pardon more eſpecially which goes into the very accepting the condition performed; for when there is imperfection ſtill in our duty, and yet he accepts it, he muſt pardon alſo, what he accepts. And thus it is that the *juſt man* is ſaid to *live by faith* in the moſt ſubtle conception. The works which the juſt man does are *his righteouſneſs* moſt certainly, and that which juſtifies him; but they are ſhort, and he could not *live* in them, but that faith ſupplies (as I ſpeak) out of Gods pardon and grace, and conſequently out of the Covenant for Chriſts ſake, what is wanting otherwiſe for acceptation unto life. I do not ſay faith ſupplies this out of Chriſts merits, as if *his* and *our* obedience were mingled, to make up that *one* righteouſneſs that juſti-

fies

fies us: but that it is our works which we perform our ſelves thro' the ſpirit, is the condition, and through Chriſts merits, both the imperfection is pardoned, and they accepted, according to covenant, upon faith. *It is of faith* ſays St *Paul, that it might be of grace.* To be of *works*, is to need no grace; but to be of *faith*, is to have ſuch works as need to be pardoned, even when they are accepted of God, for Chriſts ſake, unto everlaſting ſalvation. When *Auguſtine* does tell us ſo often that faith juſtifies, *gratiam impetrando*, let us take *grace* in *his* and alſo in *our* acception, and both together will compleat the notion. Faith goes to God for his grace, or *help*, whereby we perform the condition, and ſo juſtifies us: Faith goes to God alſo for his grace or *favour*, to pardon and accept what is done for Chriſts ſake, and ſo juſtifies us. As it does impetrate grace, or obtain his ſpirit for our duty; and then impetrates grace, or finds favour alſo for acceptance of it, take them both together, and we underſtand fully how we are juſtified by Faith. As our truſting to a good man, does naturally draw out, win, or procure his aſſiſtance which yet is free and not of debt; ſo does our truſting in God for acceptance, when it hath firſt been effectual upon us to the performing our part to that end, procure the ſame from him to our juſtification. Let us take heed of making faith a *ſingle* act as it does *ſpecificative:* and a *complex* act, as it does *reduplicative* juſtifie the believer. Theſe are two extreams I think, and to be thus compoſed. And ſo you have my poor thoughts at full upon this vexed queſtion.

I come then to the third thing wherein the Father is out, and that is in his notion of juſtification it ſelf, which is the making us juſt, by infuſion. This the Papiſts have ſo improved, as in effect to exclude pardon from it. For while they place the work of juſtification in the aboliſhing of all ſin in the *baptized* and *juſtified*, ſo that there remains no longer any thing that is *peccatum*, but *fomes peccati* only, they do, I muſt ſay in effect, put us to diſpute with them, whether there be any remiſſion of ſins at all, ſeeing the wicked are not pardoned, and the juſtified have their ſins ſo done away by this infuſed grace, as to have none; and from hence does there ſpring their doctrine of *merit*, and *perfection*, which the controverſie of *juſtification by works*, does carry along with it. Now I doubt not but the truth here (as it doth every where), is ſuffering between two theives. That there is no *merit* or *perfection* I am convinced, and that our works do not *merit* becauſe they are not *perfect:* but

that

that we are juſtified by *works*, as we are by *faith*, St *James* his words muſt go as well as St *Pauls*, and both muſt ſtand good, becauſe faith juſtifies only as productive of works. Juſtification indeed is by *works*, but not *meritorious works*: by works which make the reward to be of *grace*, but not by works which make the reward to be of *debt*, ſo the Apoſtles are before reconciled.

There are two queſtions then may adjuſt this great matter between *Us* and the *Papiſts*, or unto which the iſſue of our diſputes on this point may be reduced. In the one they have the advantage of us, in the other we have the better of them. The lover of truth muſt be humbly hardned to follow its footſteps whereſoever he finds them, whither on the one ſide or the other.

The firſt queſtion is, whether the righteouſneſs we perform our ſelves, or that Chriſt performed for us, be the *matter* of our juſtification? and I ſay, the faith, repentance, new obedience, which the Chriſtian through divine aid performs himſelf, is accepted with God for Chriſts ſake unto pardon of ſin, and eternal life. It is true, the obedience of Chriſt wrought for us, does juſtifie us *ſuo genere*, by meriting the pardoning, juſtifying Covenant, which is the donative inſtrument of pardon and life: But if the queſtion be askt, whether we have performed that which this inſtrument requires, as *conditio tituli*, it muſt be our own faith and repentance here that is the *matter* of our righteouſneſs. A man may be juſt in reſpect to the law of *innocency*, which no man but Chriſt ever was: or in reſpect to the law of *grace*, which all are, and muſt be, that are ſaved. Again, a man may be juſt in reſpect to the *preceptive* part of a law: or the *retributive* part. It is Chriſts righteouſneſs and ſacrifice alone that juſtifies us in regard of the one, but not ſo in regard of the other: yet is it that alone which is the meritorious cauſe both of the acceptation of what we do, and freedom from the Laws condemnation.

The ſecond queſtion is, whether Salvation then and juſtification is not according to our *merits*? And I anſwer, as the Scripture is clear and full from one end to the other for the *affirmative* in the *former* queſtion: ſo is the Apoſtle *Paul* as full and cleer and poſitive as can be for the *negative* in the *latter*. What is it indeed he beats upon but this altogether? that there are no works in the earth (Chriſts excepted) that do merit: and that juſtification and Salvation therefore are of grace. *Not of works, but of grace.* What is that in the ſenſe and meaning, but as much as if he ſhould

 have

have ſaid it in expreſs terms, not of *merit*, but of *grace*; or, not of works that are meritorious, and would make the reward to be of debt: but of ſuch works that though they be rewarded, it is of grace, and more than in juſtice according to the law, God needed to have done. For this is the meaning of the Apoſtle in excluding of merit. There is a paternal government according to the law of grace wherein the denyal of a reward due to our works were to overthrow all Religion: A good child by his filial behaviour merits love and benefits: We diſpute not unleſs *de nomine* only, againſt ſuch a merit as this. But as to a merit in Gods *ſtrict diſtributive* juſtice according to the law of works, or any *other* juſtice, which ſhould make our works to be meritorious *ex condigno non ſolum ratione pacti & acceptationis, ſed ratione operis*, as *Bellarmine* with ſome Papiſts does ſpeak, St *Paul* is full in the denyal. It is nothing elſe certainly but the miſapprehenſion of the word *grace* in St *Auſtin*, received by the Church of *Rome* from him, that could have blinded them ſo in this point of *Juſtification*. I have ſhewn his miſtake in this term, and in thoſe of *works*, and *grace*, and have and do here give you the right ſenſe of each according to the Apoſtle. The certain truth is this, God gave a law to man according to his creation, and if he had performed that, or any of us could perform that, then ſhould he as Creator and Rector be engaged to reward the performance according to this law, ſo that the reward ſhould be of right: but ſeeing man is fallen, and no Perſon on earth does or can perform that law, there are no works on earth that do properly merit, or no man on earth that can be juſtified, if he have only his deſert by his works. This is undoubtedly the very entendment of the Apoſtle. That all *boaſting* and *merit* may be excluded from the world, while it is proved that no mortal is juſtified or ſaved but by *grace*. And what need further conviction in this matter? we have the Papiſts own words, and general confeſſions, that they are all ſinners, and that it is through Chriſts merits that they merit. If they are ſinners, then have they not theſe works that are meritorious, but it muſt be of mercy that they are not condemned; and if it be through Chriſts merits that they merit, then is the reward not for the *work* ſake, but for *his*. And what is it that Chriſt hath *merited*, that they ſhould *merit*? It muſt come to this, that Chriſt by what he hath done for us, hath merited or procured this grace or favour from God, that he ſhould accept of our imperfect performances, which could

could not elſe be accepted, to Salvation. Of this grace he hath made and promulgated the *promiſe*. Upon the promiſe the reward becomes *due*. A reward upon promiſe, the condition being performed, becomes debt. And thus if the Papiſts ſay their good works merit, the uſe of the word is common with the Antients. Well then, let me recount this back to them, their good works merit, that is only, they make the reward due from God. They make it due from him, that is only becauſe of his promiſe. *Debet ſibi, non tibi*, ſays the Father. This promiſe is only of grace, or made freely out of favour procured by Chriſt. Our good works then muſt have ſuch a merit attributed to them, as makes the reward due only of *grace* and for *Chriſts ſake*: and not ſuch as makes it due of *right* or juſtice, and for the *works ſake*. And ſuch a merit, what is it indeed but no merit, or but a word only? It is ſuch a merit as our perfect works, which anſwer the law would have if we did them, to make the reward to be ſo of *debt* as *not* to be of *grace*, that we, and the Apoſtle diſpute againſt in this doctrine of juſtification.

To return to *Auguſtines* errour. Juſtification I very believe is to be taken in the Proteſtants notion, who do no leſs truly and judiciouſly, than induſtriouſly diſtinguiſh Sanctification and Juſtification: and, when they place the one in the work of the ſpirit renewing the whole man, and enabling us to dye unto ſin, and live unto God, they place the other in an act of Gods grace whereby he pardoneth all our ſins, and accepteth us as righteous for Chriſts ſake. As for what they add uſually in the definition that Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed to us, and made ours by faith as an inſtrument, I muſt confeſs they are notions, which as they never came into the head of St *Auſtine*, nor were received (I ſuppoſe) in the Church till within a Century or two of years ſince: ſo do I queſtion whether a Century or two more may not wear them quite away again. That the righteouſneſs of Chriſt performed in the whole courſe of his life and death was ſo pleaſing, acceptable, and ſatisfactory to God, that the whole World upon that account, or for the merit of it, ſtands reconciled to him ſo far as that he hath vouchſafed a univerſal conditional pardon, or law of grace, to all mankind, according to the tenour of the Goſpel, and conſequently that every perſon who truly repents and believes, are made partakers thereof in regard of this benefit, or in the effect, is a truth which we embrace: but when this very phraſe of the imputation

of Christs righteousness is not found in the Scripture, and the terms are used constantly in such a sense as if we were to be taken for perfectly righteous in Christs obedience, and to have satisfied the law in his sufferings all one as if our selves had performed the same, that is, as if it were ours, *in it self*, and not only in the *benefit*, or as to the end or intent Christ performs it for us, it is a conception of such another extream to that of St *Augustines*, as requires also our equal rectification.

It is manifest through the Scripture, that good works, holy duties and performances of men and women, are accepted of God, and so accepted, that they are rewarded by him with eternal Salvation. *If thou wilt have life, keep the commandements. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, eternal life. I have fought the good fight, therefore is laid up for me a Crown of righteousness. Come ye blessed of my Father, for when I was hungry ye fed me.* If then the keeping the Commandements, a patient continuance in well doing, the fighting the good fight, and our works of charity be produced in judgment, as that for which we are declared righteous, absolved and pronounced blessed, it must be in some sounder than the ordinary sense, that our Divines bring in the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us for our justification; which if it be more than absolution from sin, and acceptation of us to eternal life, let it be weighed and judged.

In *Ezekiel* the Lord is speaking of the righteous man, and repenting sinner. *When the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, shall he live? his righteousness shall not be mentioned, but in his sin which he hath sinned, he shall dye.* Again, *If the Wicked turn from his sins and does that which is right, all his transgressions which he hath committed shall not be mentioned; in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live.* It is apparent from hence, that there is a righteousness which is a mans own, a righteousness which he hath *done*, wherein the righteous man that continues in it, or the penitent sinner that turns to it, shall *live*. To live in a mans righteousness beyond doubt, is all one as to be justified by it. *He that doth them* saith the law *shall live in them*, that is shall be justified by them. If you make a question, there is another Text must convince you. *The just man shall live by his faith.* What is it to live by our faith? that you will not deny, is to be justified by it; for the Apostle alledges this Scripture to prove justification by Faith. Well! There is no man of reason now can imagine that

that the righteouſneſs which is here ſpoken of, is Chriſts righteouſneſs, and yet the righteouſneſs which is here, is that, a man ſhall live in. It follows, that it is not therefore the righteouſneſs of Chriſt from without imputed, but the righteouſneſs which man himſelf does (through Chriſt indeed meriting, and his ſpirit aſſiſting) whereby he muſt be juſtified and ſaved. It is by his *faith* that he ſhall live in one Prophet, and by his *righteouſneſs which he hath done*, in another. Put them together, and they come to one, as they muſt do, and that is, by the righteouſneſs of faith, to wit, by that righteouſneſs of life, or holy working which faith produces in a godly mans converſation, and which God requires every where as the condition of the forgiveneſs of his ſins, and the acceptation of him to life everlaſting.

It is obſerved by *Arminius* that the Apoſtle does ſeveral times in one Chapter (I count not the number,) tell us that faith is imputed for righteouſneſs. That *Abraham's was*, that ours *ſhall*, or *is*, again and again. But it is no where ſaid that Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed to us for righteouſneſs. Indeed the phraſe could not be ſo uſed. We might ſay properly enough (ſuppoſing it true in the common conſtruction) that Chriſt's righteouſneſs were imputed: but not imputed for righteouſneſs. For to be imputed for righteouſneſs is to ſtand one inſtead of perfect righteouſneſs, which cannot be ſaid of Chriſts, ſeeing that it ſelf was moſt perfect. A thing cannot be accounted inſtead of that which it is. This Argument now of *Arminius* is good, that ſeeing faith which is a mans own act is imputed for righteouſneſs; therefore, not the righteouſneſs, acts, or obedience of another. But when this acute Divine would introduce a notion hereupon, that the τὸ *credere*, therefore muſt juſtifie us, and not *works*, or not the τὸ *operari*, it is both an ill and weak conceit, which is neither of uſe nor value. For as the Scripture ſpeaks of *faith* being accounted for righteouſneſs, ſo does it tell us that *Abrahams offering his Son*, and *Phineas* act were accounted to them for righteouſneſs, and that *Rahabs* hiding the Spies did juſtifie her. That is, it is faith as productive of works, or works as produced by faith, that receives the reward of perfect righteouſneſs, which is, we are ſtill to remember alſo for Chriſts ſake, or through his merits; not imputed to us as proprietors, but prevailing with the Father for ſuch terms for ſinners as anſwers our redemption and grace of the Goſpel.

I would fain know of any man who is moſt Orthodox in his complexion,

plexion, whether he does, or is able to think, that *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Job*, who were before the law, *Samuel*, the *Kings* and *Prophets*, who were under the law, or any man or woman whatſoever before the coming of Chriſt, did ever imagine that they were righteous, and to be accepted with God for the obedience which the *Meſſiah* ſhould perform in their behalf when he came into the world, and that the believing this was an inſtrument of making it to be theirs, and ſo to be imputed to them which it could not be elſe: or whether they did not look on themſelves to be *righteous by doing righteouſly*, and to obtain Gods favour by their upright walking with him, and no otherwiſe in the World? They judged not their own righteouſneſs the meritorious cauſe of pardon to anſwer the Curſe of the Law of Innocency, but they believed in Gods mercy, and ſo repented, obeyed, and were ſaved through the Redeemer. *And* Enoch *walked with God, and God took him.* Bleſſed is the man ſays *David* who *walks in his ways, and to whom he imputeth no ſin.* In the acceptation then of a mans own upright walking, and in the pardon of his ſins, did our juſtification and bleſſedneſs lye in *Davids* time: and in the ſame no doubt does it lye ſtill under the Goſpel. I would yet fain know whether any of the Diſciples, *James*, *John*, or *Paul* himſelf, whether *Clemens Roman*, or *Alexandrine*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Cyprian*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*, or any of the Fathers, whether Councils, or School-men, whether *John Hus*, or *Wickliffe*, or any famous or holy Writer (without reſting on ſome bare incoherent ſcraps of ſentences) did ever underſtand, or receive the full notion of faiths inſtrumentality, and the imputation of a paſſive righteouſneſs before *Luther?* And if not, whether it be poſſible it ſhould be of any ſuch moment as is made of it by moſt Proteſtants? It was an Article indeed that reigned in *Martins* heart, and I do therefore give it my obeyſance: but it is no Article I take it, as the remiſſion of ſins is, in the Creed of the Apoſtles.

If the righteouſneſs of Chriſt be imputed to us (as if it were ours in it ſelf) it muſt be the righteouſneſs of his *active*, or *paſſive* obedience, or *both*. If his *active* obedience be imputed to us, then muſt we be look't upon in him as ſuch who have committed no ſin, nor omitted any duty, and then what need will there be of Chriſts death? how ſhall Chriſt dye for our ſins if we be look't on in Chriſt as having none at all? If Chriſts *paſſive* obedience be imputed, then muſt we be look't on as ſuch who in Chriſt have ſuffered and

ſatisfied

ſatisfied the law, and born the full curſe of it, and then how ſhall there be room for any pardon? The man who pays his full debt by himſelf or ſurety, can in no ſenſe be forgiven by his Creditour. Indeed the Argument of the *Socinian* from pardon againſt Chriſts ſatisfaction is not valid: but it is good againſt the imputation of it to us as if we our ſelves had ſatisfied. Chriſt may have wrought with the Father (or made him that ſatisfaction as) to procure new terms, ſo that a man may be juſtifyed as a fulfiller of them, and yet need pardon for non-performance of the old. If Chriſts active and paſſive obedience both are imputed, then muſt God be made to deal with man according to the *Covenant of works* in the buſineſs of his juſtification, when nothing is more apparent in the Scripture than that by *grace* it is, that a man is juſtified, and by *grace* ſaved. If nothing leſs than ſuch a righteouſneſs as does both anſwer, and ſatisfie the law alſo, and that fully, will ſuffice for the ſinners plea to free him from condemnation, he is not judged by the *law of grace*, but he is judged by the *law of works*, out of queſtion. There were no need to bring this notion of Chriſts imputed righteouſneſs into the Church, but that our Proteſtants miſtake themſelves, and forget that we are juſtified and ſaved by the Covenant of Grace, and not by the law of *Moſes*, or Covenant of our Creation. Chriſt came into the World to procure and tender a new law, and in this regard is he ſaid to be our Law-giver: not that he hath given any other *moral* rules of life to us (for we know his commandement only is *Love*) than what was contained in the Law before, wherein ſome do but bodly impoſe upon themſelves and others: but that he hath given the ſame precepts with *indulgence*. If God then ſhall not deal with man in his juſtification here and at judgment according to that *indulgence*, or according to the law now in Chriſts hands, that is according to the Covenant of Grace, the main buſineſs of Chriſt's coming and redemption were loſt. You ſhall hear a Proteſtant in his prayer appealing from the Tribunal of Gods Juſtice, to the throne of his grace, and yet in his Sermon be telling the people that it is nothing elſe but the perfect obedience and ſatisfaction of Chriſt imputed to them that ſaves them; which is to bring them back from the *throne of his grace*, to the *bar of his juſtice* to be judged. Such appeals have been received I ſuppoſe from the Fathers, as very ſignificant of truth, and their meaning: but not agreeable to this notion,

In the laſt place, there is a righteouſneſs revealed in the Goſpel, that

plexion, whether he does, or is able to think, that *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Job*, who were before the law, *Samuel*, the *Kings* and *Prophets*, who were under the law, or any man or woman whatsoever before the coming of Christ, did ever imagine that they were righteous, and to be accepted with God for the obedience which the *Messiah* should perform in their behalf when he came into the world, and that the believing this was an instrument of making it to be theirs, and so to be imputed to them which it could not be else: or whether they did not look on themselves to be *righteous by doing righteously*, and to obtain Gods favour by their upright walking with him, and no otherwise in the World? They judged not their own righteousnes the meritorious cause of pardon to answer the Curse of the Law of Innocency, but they believed in Gods mercy, and so repented, obeyed, and were saved through the Redeemer. *And* Enoch *walked with God, and God took him.* Blessed is the man says *David* who *walks in his ways, and to whom he imputeth no sin.* In the acceptation then of a mans own upright walking, and in the pardon of his sins, did our justification and blessedness lye in *Davids* time: and in the same no doubt does it lye still under the Gospel. I would yet fain know whether any of the Disciples, *James*, *John*, or *Paul* himself, whether *Clemens Roman*, or *Alexandrine*, *Justin Martyr*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, or any of the Fathers, whether Councils, or School-men, whether *John Hus*, or *Wickliffe*, or any famous or holy Writer (without resting on some bare incoherent scraps of sentences) did ever understand, or receive the full notion of faiths instrumentality, and the imputation of a passive righteousnes before *Luther?* And if not, whether it be possible it should be of any such moment as is made of it by most Protestants? It was an Article indeed that reigned in *Martins* heart, and I do therefore give it my obeysance: but it is no Article I take it, as the remission of sins is, in the Creed of the Apostles.

If the righteousnes of Christ be imputed to us (as if it were ours in it self) it must be the righteousnes of his *active*, or *passive* obedience, or *both*. If his *active* obedience be imputed to us, then must we be look't upon in him as such who have committed no sin, nor omitted any duty, and then what need will there be of Christs death? how shall Christ dye for our sins if we be look't on in Christ as having none at all? If Christs *passive* obedience be imputed, then must we be look't on as such who in Christ have suffered and satisfied

ſatisfied the law, and born the full curſe of it, and then how ſhall there be room for any pardon? The man who pays his full debt by himſelf or ſurety, can in no ſenſe be forgiven by his Creditour. Indeed the Argument of the *Socinian* from pardon againſt Chriſts ſatisfaction is not valid: but it is good againſt the imputation of it to us as if we our ſelves had ſatisfied. Chriſt may have wrought with the Father (or made him that ſatisfaction as) to procure new terms, ſo that a man may be juſtifyed as a fulfiller of them, and yet need pardon for non-performance of the old. If Chriſts active and paſſive obedience both are imputed, then muſt God be made to deal with man according to the *Covenant of works* in the buſineſs of his juſtification, when nothing is more apparent in the Scripture than that by *grace* it is, that a man is juſtified, and by *grace* ſaved. If nothing leſs than ſuch a righteouſneſs as does both anſwer, and ſatisfie the law alſo, and that fully, will ſuffice for the ſinners plea to free him from condemnation, he is not judged by the *law of grace*, but he is judged by the *law of works*, out of queſtion. There were no need to bring this notion of Chriſts imputed righteouſneſs into the Church, but that our Proteſtants miſtake themſelves, and forget that we are juſtified and ſaved by the Covenant of Grace, and not by the law of *Moſes*, or Covenant of our Creation. Chriſt came into the World to procure and tender a new law, and in this regard is he ſaid to be our Law-giver: not that he hath given any other *moral* rules of life to us (for we know his commandement only is *Love*) than what was contained in the Law before, wherein ſome do but bodly impoſe upon themſelves and others: but that he hath given the ſame precepts with *indulgence*. If God then ſhall not deal with man in his juſtification here and at judgment according to that *indulgence*, or according to the law now in Chriſts hands, that is according to the Covenant of Grace, the main buſineſs of Chriſt's coming and redemption were loſt. You ſhall hear a Proteſtant in his prayer appealing from the Tribunal of Gods Juſtice, to the throne of his grace, and yet in his Sermon be telling the people that it is nothing elſe but the perfect obedience and ſatisfaction of Chriſt imputed to them that ſaves them; which is to bring them back from the *throne of his grace*, to the *bar of his juſtice* to be judged. Such appeals have been received I ſuppoſe from the Fathers, as very ſignificant of truth, and their meaning: but not agreeable to this notion,

In the laſt place, there is a righteouſneſs revealed in the Goſpel, that

that God went by in his dealing with all the holy men and women who were before Chriſt, and which he goes by in his dealing with us now and all the World, whereby it is that we are juſtified in oppoſition to the *righteouſneſs of works*, the which together with the *grace of the Goſpel* in the true ſenſe and import thereof, is kept out of the *Proteſtant underſtanding* by this notion of the rigid imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs in it ſelf, that being alſo but a late and forced notion, and not tending to holineſs of life (tho' they have bin holy men that have received it), it is on the hearts I find of ſeveral Perſons, and ſorts of Perſons diſagreeing otherwiſe in their way (the providence of the Almighty who is the Author, being the Conductor of all truth to its proper uſe and end), to ſhew themſelves againſt it, and to advance this tenet (if I may offer the determination) to the contrary. That the juſtification of a ſinner is not by the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs made his in it ſelf by faith as an inſtrument: but by the *righteouſneſs of faith*; to wit, by Chriſts righteouſneſs, as the meritorious cauſe, and his faith and reſolution firſt, and ſincere obedience added after, as the condition of pardon and life through him: or by our ſincere obedience proceeding from faith, which being in it ſelf but imperfect as to the Law, is imputed for righteouſneſs to the ſinner for Chriſts merits ſake, through the grace of the Goſpel.

But now the righteouſneſs of God without the law is manifeſted, having witneſs of the Law and the Prophets. Si ergo nunc manifeſtata eſt, etiam tunc erat ſed occulta. If it be now manifeſted, it muſt have bin before lying hid. Aug. de peccato originali cont. Pel & Cel. c. 25. *Et tunc ergo iſta gratia mediatoris erat in populo Dei, ſed tanquam in vellere pluvia. And then was there this grace of the Mediator among Gods people as the rain in the fleece*, that is, though unſeen or not underſtood. *Ib.* I obſerve here that the *righteouſneſs of God*, and the *grace* of the Mediator, is rightly made by this Father to be one. We are ſaid to be juſtified by *grace*, and not by *works*: ſo by the *righteouſneſs which is of God*, and not of *works*. What then is that righteouſneſs of God which is the grace of Chriſt, and by which we are juſtified? By this grace and righteouſneſs, it is certain, that *Auſtine* underſtands inherent grace, which is a quality infuſed by the Spirit in our hearts, enabling us to good works, and that this way do the Papiſts go after him, according to what alſo is ſaid before. *Iſtam quippe gratiam qua juſtificamur, id eſt, qua Charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus noſtris —— De gratia*

tia Chriſti, c. 30. that is, *the grace whereby we are juſtified, is no other but the love of God ſhed abroad in our hearts*, or the grace of Charity whereby faith is made perfect, and ſo juſtifies as they and he agree. Now this grace is oppoſed to works, and called the righteouſneſs *which is of God*, and not of *works* according to them (which hath been ſaid before likewiſe) becauſe it is that which is given or infuſed of God, and not wrought by our own ſtrength, or procured by our deſerts. *Juſtitia ex lege dicitur quæ fit propter legis mandatum, juſtitia ex Deo dicitur quæ datur per gratiæ beneficium.* lb. c. 12. *That is ſaid to be the righteouſneſs of the law or of works, which is done through the ſtrength of our ſelves only upon the command: that is the righteouſneſs of God which we are helpt to do by the benefit of grace.* Again, *Non dicitur juſtitia noſtra ſed Dei, quia ſic ſit noſtrum ut nobis ex Deo. It is not ſaid our righteouſneſs, but the righteouſneſs of God becauſe it is ours ſo as to be firſt given of God.* In the ſame Chapter and Book. The truth is, this Father being poſſeſſed with his own diſpute, as it is incidental to the mind to faſhion all things according to the impreſſions it hath received, does frame ſuch a meaning ſtill in the words of the Apoſtle, as if *Paul* as well as he, were purpoſely writing againſt *Pelagius*. There are three things in the ſoul ſaid that Noted Perſon, *Poſſe, Velle, & Eſſe, Poſſibilitas, Voluntas & Actio*, as *Auſtine* expreſſes it, the *Power*, the *Will*, and the *Deed*. The grace of God he accounted was converſant only about the *Power*, and not the *Will*, or the *Action*. Not that he placed all grace only in the giving the power, for that muſt confound Grace and Nature indeed quite, ſeeing all have the power: but allowing grace to lye in divine *help*, the *power* alone he held was *aided* by God, and the *will* left to its ſelf. This *aid* now in explaining himſelf he confined to Doctrine. God he ſaid does reveal what he would have done in his law, and in the goſpel, and gives us beſides Chriſts example, and then the will of it ſelf (the power alone thus helped) embraces that which is good. St *Auguſtine* therefore ſets himſelf to Prove, that God does not aſſiſt us only by his word, but by operating on the will, and giving us hearts alſo to do it. And for as much as we do nothing of our ſelves but by his help, or by the operation of his ſpirit, it is by grace, ſays he, that we are juſtified, and not by works. *Quomodo eſt gratia ſi non gratis data? quomodo eſt gratia ſi ex debito redditur? How is it grace if it be not of free gift? How is it grace if it be rendered as debt?* De gra. Chr. c. 23.

Again, *Non enim Dei gratia erit ullo modo niſi gratuita fuerit omni modo. It cannot be the grace of God at all, if it be not free altogether,* De pec. or. c. 24. One would think this Father in ſuch ſpeeches as theſe had imbibed the Proteſtant notion of *grace*; but we are miſtaken, for his thoughts ſtill ran upon the grace of God infuſed in our hearts, that is the inherent work of the ſpirit which he pleads to be *gratuitous*, becauſe it is not at *firſt* given for our *merits*. The works which we do of our ſelves without grace he accounts merits nothing, but are ſplendid ſins: the works which we do from grace or by the ſpirit do juſtifie according to him, and merit eternal ſalvation. *Quod ſi vocatus vocantem ſecutus fuerit, quod eſt in libero arbitrio, merebitur & ſpiritum ſanctum per quem bona poſſit operari: in quo permanens quod nihilominus eſt in libero arbitrio, merebitur vitam æternam quæ nulla poſſit labi corrumpi. But if he that is called ſhall follow his call, which is in our free will, he ſhall merit the holy Ghoſt by whoſe help good works may be performed: wherein if he perſeveres, which is no leſs in his power, he ſhall merit eternal life, which is perfect and never fadeth away. In lib. expoſ. ad Romanos.* The Proteſtant meeting with this doctrine in the Papiſt are no ways ſatisfied with ſuch an interpretation. By the *Righteouſneſs of God* therefore, as by the *grace* of God, oppoſed to *works*, they will by all means conceive of a righteouſneſs without us, that is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which is not ours by *performance*, but by *faith*. But neither the Proteſtants after *Luther*, nor the Papiſts after *Auſtine* have hit the mind of the Apoſtle. The *righteouſneſs of God* and *grace* oppoſed to *works* is really nothing elſe but the righteouſneſs of the Covenant of Grace accepted by God for Chriſts ſake, inſtead of the righteouſneſs of the Covenant of Works. Herein are two things comprized, the meritorious righteouſneſs of Chriſt procuring the pardoning Covenant of Grace, & our performing the Condition. Only we are to know this *righteouſneſs* may be underſtood therefore either with reſpect to *God* as it is all one I ſay with his *grace*: or with reſpect to *Us*, as it is all one with that, upon which this grace is vouchſafed. *Charitas Dei dicta eſt diffundi in cordibus noſtris, non qua nos ipſe diligit, ſed qua nos facit delectores ſuos: ſicut juſtitia Dei, qua juſti ejus munere efficimur. As it is called the love of God whereby we are made to love him, ſo the righteouſneſs of God whereby we are made righteous through his gift. Aug. de ſpir. & lit. c. 32.* It is true that this righteouſneſs is wrought in us by the ſpirit, and flows not from our ſelves; it is true alſo that as we perform it by his aid, it is our

own

own work: yet is not the one the reaſon why it is called the *righteouſneſs of God*, nor the other any hinderance why it ſhould not be ſo called: for the reaſon lyes altogether in the oppoſition of it meerly to that of *works*. Let a man do all that he can, whether by his own ſtrength, or by Gods aid, he can never come up to the law of works, or to a conformity to the terms of the Covenant of *nature* or Law of *Moſes*, as it was a repreſentation of that Covenant, ſo that by the deeds thereof he cannot be juſtified: and for as much as it pleaſed God therefore to vouchſafe us a new law, the law of faith, or grace, or the new Covenant having lower terms, that in the performance hereof, or in a conformity only hereunto, the man who is a ſinner in reſpect of the law, may be righteous, and ſo God juſt in juſtifying him, this grace and condeſcention of God being meerly from his own good will, is called thus the *righteouſneſs which is of him*, in oppoſition to the other which of *nature*: and ſo were ours, *or mans righteouſneſs* properly, if he could attain unto the ſame. But when he cannot attain unto that which is ſo by *nature*, whatſoever he attains, if it be leſs, muſt be a righteouſneſs only through *grace*, which notwithſtanding our ſhortneſs, God mercifully condeſcends to accept, inſtead of that which is perfect, through the merits of our Saviour, and in regard of that acceptation (*N. B.*) or this good will, it is called *his*, or the righteouſneſs *which is of him* (of his own free contriving, appointing, tender and allowance), when in regard of performance it is ours, though we do it by his help. Lo here the true key that opens the mind of the Apoſtle, and conſequently the door to that treaſure which depends upon it.

That which is ſaid I know by ſome Proteſtants moſt to the quick is this, that *pardon* indeed is an act of meer *grace*, but *juſtification* is an act of *juſtice* according to law, and therefore muſt Chriſts righteouſneſs which alone does anſwer the law be brought in to juſtifie the believer. But this is a miſtake, for whether juſtification lyes in pardon or no, according to that of the Apoſtle, [*Even as* David *deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works, ſaying, bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven*] it is expreſly declared by the Apoſtle to be *by grace*, *Being juſtified freely by his grace*. True indeed, it is an act of *righteouſneſs*, even a judicial or forenſical act, that is according to law, but what law? not the *law of Works*, but according to the *law of Faith*. It is an act I ſay of that *righteouſneſs* of God, and no other which the Apoſtle ſets forth in oppoſition to the *law* and *works*, and makes all

one with his *grace*. To reckon it then an act of juſtice according to the Law, intending thereby the law of works, is to correct the Apoſtle, and to tell him we know better how we are juſtified by Chriſt than he. It is the underſtanding of this righteouſneſs whereof we are now ſpeaking will ſet us all right. It is Chriſts obedience and ſufferings alone no doubt which could make any compenſation to God for our ſins, that he might without diminution to his honour as Law-giver, or Governour, recede from his firſt law, but when Chriſt hath by his ſatisfaction procured this, that God ſhould now deal with us by a new law, the remedying law, or upon other terms, the thing is manifeſt in it ſelf, that the righteouſneſs then which is pleaded and accepted for this ſatisfaction ſake of Chriſt, muſt be this righteouſneſs of the new law, or the righteouſneſs of *faith* and not of *works*; which both denominates the performer righteous, and God juſt in juſtifying him according to it. *For Chriſt is the end of the law for righteouſneſs to every one that believeth.* That is, as I conſtrue it, Chriſt by his ſatisfaction hath procured that we ſhould not be judged by the law of works, and conſequently that righteouſneſs, or juſtification, be attained if we do but perform the terms of the Goſpel. *To declare I ſay at this time his righteouſneſs that he might be juſt and a juſtifier of him that believes in Jeſus. Who is made unto us of God*, (that is a phraſe I take it ſignifying no more than through whom (one way or other *ſenſu cauſali* or *ejus merito*) God would have us obtain all ſpiritual bleſſings) *wiſdom, righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption.*

After this there are no texts I count (ſuch as the laſt purpoſely mentioned) which are preſſed by our Divines for their ſervice before, that are able to carry ſuch a burthen. *He hath made him ſin for us* (ſin as the expiatory ſacrifice under the law is called ſin) *who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.* That is, he who was the immaculate Lamb was made a ſacrifice for our ſins, that we may become righteous with the righteouſneſs of God, which he accepts through him. Chriſt as a Sacrifice redeems us from the law of ſin, and purchaſes for us a law of grace: according to that law we have a righteouſneſs which is accepted unto life through Chriſt. I pray note it therefore, it is not ſaid that his righteouſneſs might be made ours, nor that we might be made his righteouſneſs: but that we might be made *the righteouſneſs of God.* And what is the righteouſneſs of God I have ſhewn you juſt now, and what *in him* likewiſe is declared here

to-

together with it. *Ut ſimus juſtitia Dei in ipſo. Hæc eſt illa juſtitia Dei, non qua ipſe juſtus eſt, ſed qua nos ab eo facti. That we ſhould become the righteouſneſs of God in him. This is that righteouſneſs of God, not whereby he is righteous, but whereby we are made ſo of him. Auguſtine* again, in the laſt cited place. It is true, that then there is a righteouſneſs of *faith*, and righteouſneſs of *God* (of faith as the root of the whole condition) which are one, and by which in oppoſition to the *righteouſneſs of works* we are juſtified; but that this righteouſneſs of *God* and of *Faith*, is only the obedience of Chriſts life and death which he performed for us, is aſſumed as much without reaſon, as any conſent of that Father. To this purpoſe, I take it, is God ſtyled in the Old Teſtament, *The Lord our righteouſneſs*, that is, in his condeſcention to accept us for Chriſts ſake as righteous by a law of grace, when in ſtrict juſtice he might condemn us for ſinners. It is not appropriated to the ſecond Perſon, but to be underſtood of that Goſpel goodneſs of God whereby he imputeth righteouſneſs to us, when we have none according to the law of our creation, that is imputing the righteouſneſs of faith to us without the works of that Covenant. *All our merits O Lord* (ſays the Father) *are thy mercy.* This is the true and excellent import of that expreſſion, ſignifying moreover that God hath found out the means to demonſtrate his juſtice no leſs fully (and his goodneſs more fully) to the World in ſaving us by this new law, through his Sons mediation, than if we had kept our firſt innocency, or underwent his eternal judgment for our tranſgreſſions.

Another text which is a fellow with this, I take it in ſenſe and words, is that to the *Romans. As by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners: ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous:* For the interpretation of this Text, there are two things only I can ſay firmly. One is that the opinion that God does look on a believer, or that a believer may look on himſelf, to have fully obeyed the Law in Chriſts obedience, ſo as it is by imputation his in its ſelf, is ſo groſs an apprehenſion, that it is beyond my belief. This is the perfect *Antinomian* faith, which excludes repentance quite out of his life. The other is, that in what ſenſe ſoever he is *righteous* through *Chriſts obedience* it can be no otherwiſe, than that as he is *a ſinner* through *Adams ſin*, and that ſin, the eating the forbidden fruit, cannot be his in it ſelf, but in its Fruit, or effects onely. I comment therefore theſe words thus.

As

As through *Adams* ſin we came into the ſtate of the fall, and ſo do all ſin, or are ſinners againſt the law, which none fulfil: ſo by Chriſts obedience to his Father whereby he procured the grace of a new law for us we are brought to ſuch a ſtate, as that many become righteous, and are juſtified by the performance. That all man-kind is involved in *Adams* firſt ſin, our Divines are agreed againſt *Pelagius*. The moſt underſtand this to come through the *Covenant* or *Will* of God: there are ſome apt to conceive only that *Adam* being the natural root of mankind, human nature it ſelf ſinned in him, and ſo when we come to exiſt, his guilt is derived upon our perſons as *vertually* and *ſeminally* in him, no otherwiſe then *Levi* is ſaid to have paid tythes to *Melchiſedech* in the loyns of *Abrabam*. I ſhould incline to this explanation, but that I ſee not then why all the ſins of *Adam* beſides, and of all our Progenitors, ſhould not be *ours* alſo upon the ſame account, as much as that *firſt* tranſgreſſion. Diſtinguiſh we therefore between the *precept*, thou ſhalt not eat of the Tree, under this Covenant: and the *threatning* upon breach of it. The Precept plainly belong'd to our firſt Parents only, and as none of us broke that precept which we had not, ſo can we not be reputed to have that ſin (in it ſelf) which we never committed: nevertheleſs the penalty being by the Will or Covenant of God to extend to their progeny (which falls out ordinarily in mans laws alſo), that ſin of *Adams* which *in it ſelf* could be *his* only, in the *effects* threatned upon the commiſſion does become *ours* alſo. God does ſo impute that act to us, that we are all, as well as he, deprived of original righteouſneſs, corrupted in our nature, and ſure to dye: In like manner (I take it) are we to conceive of the imputation both of our ſins to Chriſt, and of his righteouſneſs to us. Our ſins are not laid upon him to make a ſinner; but to be a propitiation for our ſins. He was not made ſin or accounted a ſinner, *quoad reatum culpæ*, as if he were guilty of our facts, but he was dealt with as a ſinner, *quoad reatum pœnæ*, in regard to the obligation unto ſatisfaction, which as a *Sponſor* he was to make in our behalf. The righteouſneſs of Chriſt likewiſe which he performed as *Sponſor* or *Mediator*, cannot be ours either really or repreſentatively *in it ſelf*, becauſe this righteouſneſs as Mediator is proper to his Perſon, and is not the very ſame required of any, or all of us in the law it ſelf? but his righteouſneſs as Mediator, even his whole ſubmiſſion to the law of his Mediatorſhip in life and death, is ours *reſpectively* as to what it procured, or to what he intended

tended it ſhould procure, in as much as we are partakers of the benefits that derive from it. Our *ſins* were *Chriſts* in the *cauſation* of his ſufferings: Chriſts *righteouſneſs* is *ours* in the *effects* of pardon and life eternal.

A third text, and which carryes our Divines I think more than any, is that to the *Philipians. I count all things but loſs that I may win Chriſt, and be found in him not having mine own righteouſneſs which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Chriſt, the righteouſneſs which is of God by faith.* In theſe words, our Proteſtants obſerve that the righteouſneſs of God, and of faith, is oppoſed to that righteouſneſs which is our *own*, and therefore it muſt be a righteouſneſs *without Us*, received by faith. But they are miſtaken; for, beſides that the righteouſneſs of *faith* and of *God*, is not the ſame with the righteouſneſs of *Chriſt*, as hath been before obſerved, they are to know that this righteouſneſs which *Paul* calls his *own* in this Text, is the righteouſneſs of the *Jew*; that is, the *Jews own*, or his own as a *Jew* & a *Phariſee*; not *our own*, or his own as a Chriſtian. This appears from the Verſes before: *If any thinketh that he hath whereof he may truſt in the fleſh, I more, circumciſed the eighth day, an Hebrew of the Hebrews as touching the Law of Phariſees, as touching righteouſneſs which is of the law blameleſs.* This appears farther from another text, which together with this alone is all that hath any ſuch Antitheſis in the Terms τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην, from whence they fetch this conjecture. *I bear them record that they have a Zeal for God, but not according to knowledg. For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves to the righteouſneſs of God.* It is certain now from theſe places both, that there is a righteouſneſs which was *Pauls own* and the *Jews own* which he excludes from juſtification, and oppoſes to the righteouſneſs of *faith* and of *God*: but this I ſay is not the *Chriſtian* righteouſneſs. The Chriſtians faith & new obedience are his own acts out of doubt by Gods help, & *his* righteouſneſs according to the Goſpel: & you ſhall never read St *Paul* ſaying, *I deſire to be found in Chriſt not having my own* repentance, *my own* faith, love, and new obedience, which are conditions of being *found in him* that we may be juſtified. *Pauls* own righteouſneſs as a *Jew*, or as a *Phariſee* I ſay is one thing, and *Pauls* faith and obedience which is his righteouſneſs as a *Chriſtian* is another, And this diſtinction our Saviour himſelf hath firſt offered: *Except your righteouſneſs, exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees.*---The

righte-

righteouſneſs of works is twofold. The righteouſneſs of *Mankind*, according to the Covenant of *Nature*: and the righteouſneſs of the *Jews*, while they reckoned to be juſtified by the external obſervation only of the rites of *Moſes*. The one of theſe *exceeds* the righteouſneſs of faith, and we are not juſtified by it, becauſe no man can attain to it: the other *falls ſhort* of the righteouſneſs of faith, or of a true Chriſtian, according to theſe words of our Lord, and for that reaſon, as for ſeveral others, the eſtabliſhment of it was dangerous to their Salvation.

A laſt text they have, *what the law could not do in that it was weak through the fleſh, God ſending his own Son in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh, and for ſin condemned ſin in the fleſh: that the righteouſneſs of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the fleſh but after the Spirit.* It is urged here by a Perfectiſt, that if the Proteſtant doctrine were true, it ſhould be ſaid that the righteouſneſs of the law ſhould be fulfilled in Chriſt, and not in us. But theſe words I apprehend may be a phraſe of the Apoſtles, as the words *attaining unto righteouſneſs* otherwhere; and ſo it will be all one as if he had ſaid, *that we might be juſtified, who walk not after the fleſh, but after the Spirit.* Nevertheleſs, there is this here muſt be known and noted, that when a Chriſtian obeys God according to the Goſpel, that obedience of his proceeding from faith, though imperfect, is accepted of God inſtead of the laws perfect righteouſneſs, or ſtands him in the ſtead for Chriſts ſake as if the whole law were fulfilled, which is the ground of ſuch expreſſions. From whence in the way we may have light for the underſtanding the Apoſtle, when he tells us *the law is eſtabliſhed by faith*, or uſes the like words. The law is eſtabliſhed only by the fulfilling of it; and faith as it works by love fulfils the law. But how? why in the ſenſe (*N. B.*) as is now told you. Faith produces obedience which is imperfect, yet anſwering the terms of the Goſpel, it is, through that grace and condeſcention from God which Chriſt hath purchaſed for us in the work of our redemption, imputed to us for righteouſneſs, that is, accepted and rewarded ſo, as it is made to ſtand us in the ſame ſtead as the full performance of the law would have done, which is to juſtifie us, and bring us life eternal.

When God made man he gave him a law ſuitable to his Creation. That law being founded in the image of God, wherein he was created, is moſt holy, equal, and unchangeable. God as Rector muſt deal with the World according to this law, ſo that man tran-

tranſgreſſing, he is engaged to proceed againſt him by it, unleſs there be ſome means found out that he may be no loſer in his juſtice if he do not. There is nothing can be offered to God but his juſtice and holineſs muſt be loſers, if it be of conſideration leſs valuable than that which the law it ſelf required, which is the obedience of all mankind, or their everlaſting ſuffering for its tranſgreſſion. No Man or Creature but Chriſt alone could offer any ſuch ſatisfaction as this for us. And this he offered in the obedience or righteouſneſs of his whole life and death, as the price, ſacrifice, ranſome, propitiation for our ſins: which through the dignity of the Perſon that offered it, being the Son of God as as well as man, was of value which is infinite. That which exceeds a thing or is more in value than it, cannot be the very thing it ſelf which in value it exceeds. The righteouſneſs then of Chriſt is really imputed to man, tendred in his behalf; and made ours in regard of this effect (or *in the end* to which it was intended I will ſay, when it cannot be ours *in it ſelf*), to wit, that God being ſatisfied or made no loſer in his juſtice hereby does deal with us otherwiſe than by that law unto which at firſt we were created. If he deals not with us then according to that, it muſt be by ſome other, which hereby alſo is purchaſed; and that is according to his *grace* or *righteouſneſs* revealed in the Goſpel. This grace of righteouſneſs lyes in his acceptance of faith and repentance inſtead of perfect obedience for this righteouſneſs ſake of Chriſt thus imputed, and no otherwiſe than thus. When our Divines now ſay that there are no works of ours can ſtand before God in his diſtrict judgment that they ſhould be *cauſa propter quam*, *the cauſe for which*, (that is for the merit ſake, or worthineſs whereof) he ſhould juſtifie any perſon, they ſay well; and their meaning is, that our works coming not up to the *original law*, God cannot for the performance of them, abſolve us as no ſinners? but yet ſeeing they are ſuch as anſwer the terms of the Goſpel, he does for Chriſt's ſake, or his merits ſake, both pardon their imperfection, and impute them to us for righteouſneſs, in the accepting them to life, or rewarding them with everlaſting Salvation. In ſhort, Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed to us, but not for righteouſneſs. It is *for the righteouſneſs ſake*, but not formally though efficiently *by the righteouſneſs* of another we are juſtified. It is not Chriſt, but our ſelves, that perform the new Covenant, and by the *new Covenant* is it, or by *grace*, that we are righteous in Gods ſight. It is not conſequently

Chriſts ſufferings or obedience, only, but our Faith, Obedience, ſincerity alſo, that is rewarded with Salvation: yet is it not for the merit of this obedience of ours, but for his merits, or the merits of his righteouſneſs. Behold! this is the critical hindge upon which the whole controverſie does turn. We will ſtand for the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs (*N. B.*) ſo far as ever we can with holding juſtification by the Covenant of grace; but when ſome Proteſtants have ſtood for it ſo, as renders our juſtification to be by the *Law*, or the Covenant of works, and not by *grace*, they have departed from the Apoſtle. And thus the diſpute in the upſhot will I think end in this, that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the *meritorious*, indeed the *only meritorious*, or meritoriouſly *procuring efficient*, but muſt not be made the *formal* cauſe of mans juſtification.

And yet do I ſee there is need ſtill of ſome more words, ſeeing here the heart of all lyes. A righteouſneſs we muſt have if we be juſtified, and what is that righteouſneſs? There is a *Legal* righteouſneſs: and *Evangelical*. Chriſts righteouſneſs our Divines account our Legal righteouſneſs which muſt anſwer the law for us: & our faith and repentance muſt be produced to anſwer the Goſpel. The latter of theſe I take to be plain; the former muſt be warily underſtood. There is the *Precept*, and the *Retribution* of the law. We muſt take heed that we conceive not Chriſt to be our legal righteouſneſs in regard to the *Preceptive* part of the law (in the more frequent ſenſe), as if we were reputed by God to have fulfilled the ſame, or ſatisfied it in him as repreſenting our Perſons, which is the errour before confuted, and eſpecially by the reaſon laſt mentioned, becauſe this makes our juſtification to be by the law of *works*, (and not of *grace*) which ſubverts the Goſpel; but there is a righteouſneſs in regard to the *Retributive* part of the law of works, conſiſting in our diſcharge from its curſe and penalty, which is a *righteouſneſs of pardon*, and if any will call this our *Legal* righteouſneſs (which is yet conferred by the *Goſpel*,) and account we have it in Chriſt, underſtanding nothing elſe by it, but that his righteouſneſs is the meritorious cauſe of it, I know not any will oppoſe him, for this is that wherein we all center. It is true, that *pardon* and *righteouſneſs* without explication is a contradiction, and therefore when we allow of a *righteouſneſs of pardon*, there is a *ſtrict* and a *large* ſenſe to be acknowledged of *terms* uſed in Scripture. Bleſſed is the *man unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works*. The imputation of righteouſneſs to a perſon is to account him righteous,

righteous, and for a man to be accounted righteous *without works*, that is without righteouſneſs, is (or may be ſuppoſed to be) explained in the next verſe, *viz.* to be *pardoned*. By *works*, he underſtands works of the *Law* out of doubt, for without faith and repentance (or *Goſpel* works) God imputes righteouſneſs to none. Now how a man may be righteous according to the *law of grace*, and yet need pardon in reference to the *law of works*, the matter is plain; but to make a man *righteous* (through this pardon) in regard to the *Retribution*, and *guilty* in regard to the *Precept* of the ſame law, is a more perplext conception. To be acquitted from the condemnation of a law by being pronounced innocent, or to be adjudged to the reward by being declared to have fulfilled it, is in the ſtrict ſenſe to be juſtified; To be acquitted from the condemnation and be pronounced guilty, is to be *delivered* from the law, and not to be *juſtified*, but in a large ſence of juſtification. Juſtification *from* a law, and not *by* it, is a Catechreſtical ſpeech, and I do queſtion whether we ſhould not (uſing a ſtrict ſpeaking) place the diſcharge of the ſinner from condemnation, upon the ſcore of Chriſts *redemption*, rather than on the work of our *juſtification*. That *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World to himſelf not imputing their treſpaſſes*, does import an univerſal conditional remiſſion beſtowed upon all, ſo far as a delivery of the whole World over from the *law of works* to be judged by the *law of grace*; and when we are at that bar, there is no inqueſt like to be made about Chriſts work, whether he hath done his part, but whether we have done ours, that is performed our condition; and if we be found to have been upright to God in the main bent of our hearts and lives, notwithſtanding our manifold failings, he accepts of us for Chriſts ſake, and declares us righteous according to this law; and ſo adjudges us to the reward or promiſe which is to have Chriſt and his benefits, whereof one is the application of his redemption, and therein our diſcharge from the Laws condemnation. And thus methinks the Apoſtle ſpeaks with more accurateneſs, where juſtification and redemption are *de induſtria* diſtinguiſhed, and the one made the means or foundation to the other. *Being juſtified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Redemption is the delivery of the World in general from the law, and ſo from its penalty on terms appointed by the Redeemer; Juſtification is the pronouncing of particular perſons accepted upon thoſe terms, and ſo to have a right to the purchaſed poſſeſſion. In fine, there is but our own ſincerity, and a right

to impunity and life, is all the righteouſneſs (if a *right* be *righ-teouſneſs*) that goes as ours in its ſelf (and Chriſts only in regard to that effect) to a mans juſtification.

The import of all is, we are not to conceive a ſinner to be brought before *two* bars that he ſhould have need of a righteouſneſs of perfect obedience in Chriſt to plead againſt the law, for Chriſt hath redeemed us from coming before this bar, by the ranſome of his blood paid for all the World: but being to ſtand only at *one* bar, it is but one righteouſneſs is ſought as the condition upon which the ſentence muſt paſs, and as for that *Righteouſneſs* we have through Chriſt beſides, which is in regard only to the *retribution*, not the *work* of the law (if *Pardon* (I ſay) may be ſo called) it comes to us by way of ſentence, or as a part of the reward given upon the condition performed. Only the redemption of Chriſt, I count is to be firſt ſuppoſed, with the whole righteouſneſs of his Mediatorſhip, as the foundation, through the merits whereof, this new covenant is purchaſed, and ſo the reward given, for his ſake, upon that condition. And if it be for Chriſts ſake, for his merits, righteouſneſs, mediation, redemption ſake, we ſee alſo how this righteouſneſs of his, even his Mediatory righteouſneſs which cannot be ours poſſibly *in it ſelf*, is yet imputed to us and made ours in the *effects*, or in the end to which it was performed, for ſalvation to Believers.

I will conclude all with the agreement of the two Apoſtles, which hath been already, but lightly, before touched.

When *Paul* then contends, that a man is not juſtified by the works of the law. By the works of the law, he means works as would juſtify him according to law if he had them, and ſays no man is juſtified hereby, becauſe no man hath them, as he proves at large in the firſt and ſecond Chapters to the *Romans*, as the very buſineſs and ſcope of both, to any that will conſider of the matter, and ſo pleads a neceſſity of their *believing that they may be juſtified.* But when St *James* ſays a man is juſtified by works, he means not works that anſwer the law, or ſuch as of themſelves would juſtifie the doer, which no man hath, neither *Abraham* himſelf, much leſs *Rahab* whom he alſo mentions, but ſuch works as ſuppoſe grace to their acceptance through faith in the Redeemer, for the reconciling the Perſon, and covering his imperfections. And thus the two holy Penmen diſagree not: but while the one ſaith, *I conclude a man is juſtified by faith without the works of the law*, and the other,

other. *You ſee then how that by works a man is juſtified, and not by faith only*, the ſenſe of both is, that though a man hath not the works of the law (the works the law *qua fœdus* requires of him) which would juſtifie the doer if he did them (as for certain he does not, it being impoſſible for any to have theſe, ſo that if he be juſtified at all, he muſt be juſtified *without* them): yet is he juſtified by faith, provided that faith be accompanied with (or is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of) good works of another ſize; to wit, that will not make the reward to be of *debt*, but of *grace*, or that are unperfect and not able to juſtifie him by law, yet are required in ſincerity of life, together with his faith in the Redeemer (ſuppoſing him revealed, or elſe in the merciſulneſs of Gods nature) unto final juſtification, and ſalvation.

And now Reader, if thou art offended at this paper, I cannot help thy prejudice, but I deſire thee to hear reaſon. If thou art ſenſible of that deadly advantage which is given to the Papiſts, by our ill treating this point, by the doctrine I mean more particularly, of Chriſts righteouſneſs *imputed* in the unſound ſenſe, eſpecially when thoſe that expound it worſe, do ordinary lay moſt ſtreſs upon it: If thou art ſenſible yet nearer home, what a ſtumbling block hereby hath been laid in the way of a late numerous Sect among us (whom to name, methinks is ſome rudeneſs to them), that really having our Miniſters here by the lock (that is the place where their only ſtrength they have againſt us does lye), do reject the whole Tribe, as Falſe Teachers that harbour men in their ſins, and make Chriſt ſerve only to be a cover for them, as they bitterly traduce us, with great indignation, and in very earneſt on this account (which I muſt confeſs hath affected me ſo much in reading their books, as to ſet me to write, and gives me yet a good conſcience in what I do, though thou perhaps art angry with me for it) if laſtly thou art ſenſible of the evil and danger of *Libertiniſm* or *Antinomianiſm*, which hath been lately ſo riſe, though now allayed in this Land, what roots yet it hath alive in this notion miſ-underſtood, thou wilt be adviſed with me, and others perhaps that ſee more than I, that it is time, that it is fit, this Sluce be ſtopt. The *Presbyterians* are my Friends, and the *Independants* my Friends, and Others my Friends, but Truth is greateſt, and muſt overcome.

Deo Gloria mihi condonatio.

J. H.

Reader!

The Paper Printed next this of Juſtification *was* The middle way of Election and Redemption, *where there is nothing ſaid of this Point; but in the next Papers of the* Covenant, Law, and Goſpel, *and of* Perfection, *there being more offered about the ſame, it is neceſſary (that you may have the Authors full thoughts) to be ſupplied.*

Out of the Paper of the *Covenants.*

IT is one reaſon of my ſending out theſe ſheets thus in ſingle Papers, that I may have the opportunity my ſelf of Reflexion. If any thing be wanting I may ſupply it; where I am in the dark I may explain it, or call for Light; If I erre, I may correct it, and put my ſelf at eaſe ſtill when I need, as to the whole. It is verily a fooliſh thing I count for any man to think that he can ſpeak or write ſo, as what he hath once ſpoken or written cannot be mended. When we change our thoughts every day and week in our private Studies, what a vain reſolution is it, that becauſe we have Preached or Printed thus, the ſhutters muſt be drawn up preſently, and no more Light be let to come in upon us. For my part I declare, I will never Preach or Print upon ſuch terms, but upon theſe: That I may be miſtaken; That I may acknowledg it, if I be convinced. That I may therefore be controuled, and have leave to be indifferent to my own opinion, as to anothers.

In my Paper of Juſtification, I count there are two parts. The one is, a Reconciliation of *James* and *Paul*, and ſo of *faith* and *works* in that point; wherein I muſt confeſs I am the more confirmed, by ſeeing the ſame Notions as I have had many Years in my mind growing up ſince I wrote in the Books of ſuch Authors, as the *Theſes* of *Le Blanc*, Mr. *Truman*, Sir *Charles Woleſly*, to name no more. The other is concerning the *imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs*, which does require more words from me before

before I come to another Subject, for my own ſatisfaction.

That Chriſts righteouſneſs does juſtifie us *from the Law*, and ſo from Sin, and from Condemnation, I do hold no leſs than others: but that Chriſts righteouſneſs does juſtifie us *by the Law*, is I take it an over-grown conception. It is certain, that no works of man be we never ſo holy, are able to ſtand before God in his diſtrict judgment; that is, if he ſhould deal with us according to the exact juſtice of the Law without ſhewing us any mercy, which will be acknowledged by *Proteſtants* and *Papiſts*, who are ready to pray both with *David*, *Enter not into judgment with thy ſervants O Lord, for in thy ſight ſhall no fleſh living be juſtified.* If any *Papiſt* then ſhall think that mans righteouſneſs is made ſo perfect by Chriſts merits: or, any *Proteſtant*, that Chriſts righteouſneſs it ſelf is ſo made ours, as that we are juſtified by the Law, upon that account, they are both miſtaken. This is the only true extreamity on both ſides: for it is not by the *Law*, but by *Faith*; by the *Evangelical* covenant, or by *Grace* that we are juſtified. *We are not under the Law*, ſays the Apoſtle, *but under Grace.* It is enough for a poor ſinner to have a righteouſneſs imputed to him *without works*, and that he is pardoned; but to have a righteouſneſs imputed to him *with works*, is more than we can find to be allowed him. Chriſts righteouſneſs is ſuch, and to have that made ours *in its ſelf*, or ſo, as that in Gods reckoning we muſt be as righteous as he, I muſt needs ſay, it is not harder perhaps to believe that the bread is turned into Chriſts Body (where we have a text for it) in the Sacrament: than to believe ſuch a conceit (for which we have no Scripture at all) in the matter of Juſtification. What then? Do I deny imputation? No, but I explain it. It is by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, *not inherent in us*, our Divines will ſay Ordinarily, *but imputed to us*, that we are juſtified. And what if I thus interpret this for them; that is, not *as if we had done in his Perſon what Chriſt did*, but by his righteouſneſs *made ours* in the *effects* only? So the Maſterfully Learned Biſhop *Forbs* expreſly, *Hoc eſt, Quoad effectum & fructum* (See *Conſiderationes modeſtæ. De juſtificatione*, l. 2. c. 2.) This is the Mediocrian Determination, and not out of Mr *Baxter*.

Indeed a man can hardly conſider the Doctrin of St *James* never ſo little with that of *Paul* which is one part of my Paper, but it will lead him to the other, which is to ſee that what our Proteſtants ſay ordinarily on this matter, does need a favour-

able

able expoſition. It is a jejune thing, I count, to bring the great diſpute that *Paul* hath with the Jews about juſtification to this reſult only, whether we are juſtified by *Faith*, or the proper *Work* or *Fruits* of it? It is but a little more ſatisfactory to bring it only to this, whether it be by the obſervation of *Moſes* Law? For though this was the occaſion of the diſpute, and the Apoſtle therefore does ſhew them how it was by the *Promiſe*, and ſo by *Faith* that *Abraham* and the *Jews* themſelves had life, and not by the *Law*, which was but a *Schoolmaſter* to lead them thereunto, or *unto Chriſt*: yet it is manifeſt, that he advances the point higher, while he tells them that by *Works* neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* could be juſtified, ſo that by *works* he muſt mean the obſervation of that *Law of works* which was common to both, and not *Moſes* Law only: and the reſolution of the diſpute in both *Apoſtles* comes to this (as I have ſaid) that it is by the performance of the Covenant of *Grace*, and not of the covenant of *works*, or Law of *Moſes*, that a man is to look for life everlaſting. I muſt add, Nor are they to be heard in a third place, who ſay, that the diſpute between *Paul* and the *Jews* is neither of theſe, but whether we are juſtified by our *Own* righteouſneſs, or by the Righteouſneſs of *Chriſt*, and ſo reſolve that it is not by any *works*, which we do, even *faith* it ſelf as a *work*, but by the *works* Chriſt hath done for us, that is, by the obedience of his life and death only. For though this be taught ordinarily by our *Proteſtants*, and is co-incident with the firſt reſult, there is one thing I muſt ſay theſe *Divines* have not conſidered which I have offered them in my *Paper*, that muſt bring them to another underſtanding. It is this, that the *Apoſtle* does indeed ſtand much upon the *Righteouſneſs of God* in oppoſition to *works*, in the buſineſs of juſtification, but never oppoſes our *works* to the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*: the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt in their ſenſe being truly a very contrary thing to the *Righteouſneſs of God* in the ſenſe of the *Apoſtle*. The righteouſneſs of God according to the *Apoſtle*, if I may then deſcribe it but as well as I can, and as the thing is, and a little more fully than I have in my former paper, is, on *Gods part*, his taking our human frailty or faln nature into that meet conſideration, as not to deal with us in his *diſtrict judgment* which we cannot bear, but according to his *Covenant of Mercy*: the righteouſneſs, ſacrifice, attonement or ſatisfaction of Chriſt being ſuppoſed as the foundation upon which his Juſtice does ſtand good, notwithſtanding this condeſcention: And conſequently on

Mans

Mans part, this righteouſneſs is our imperfect duty performed in ſincerity according to this *new Law*, and ſo for Chriſts ſake accepted to Salvation. In this ſenſe am I apt to underſtand that *everlaſting Righteouſneſs* which is *brought in*, by the Meſſiah, or by his covenant, in *Daniel*: and in this ſenſe do I conſtrue that Title, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*.

There is the *uncreated*, *abſolute* righteouſneſs of God, which is the Divine eſſence it ſelf, for as God is *Truth* in the abſtract, ſo is he *Righteouſneſs*: or the *created*, *relative* righteouſneſs of God, that is his righteouſneſs ſet forth in relation to us, which conſiſts in his dealing with us as his Creatures according to our conditions. This *relative* righteouſneſs then is double. The *Righteouſneſs* or *Juſtice* of God according to the Covenant of works: and the righteouſneſs or equity of God according to the Covenant of grace. The one I count to be that our Divines call his *Strict*: the other his *Paternal* Juſtice. When God made man at firſt and gave him the Law of his Creation, he was to deal with him according to this perfect Law, and it was but equal according to his perfect ſtate, and this being the original righteouſneſs (as I may ſay) of God in relation to us, there are none of us but do find ſome ſenſe of it in our hearts, that makes us not ſo much only to *fear*, as to be *afraid* of him under that apprehenſion. But there is another *righteouſneſs* than this, which was ever a foot in the world ſince the promiſe of the *womans ſeed*, or elſe there were no man could have bin ſaved, though it be ſaid to be now *manifeſted* (as *brought in*, in *Daniel's* phraſe) becauſe the reaſon upon which it is founded, that is mans reconciliation to God by Chriſt, is revealed by the Goſpel, and this is the *righteouſneſs of God* oppoſed to *works* (or to his ſtrict Juſtice which he was bound to exerciſe according to the *Covenant of works*) that is ſo magnified by the Apoſtle. And here now is a diſtinction to be uſed which I have intimated, and want Terms to expreſs. For this righteouſneſs of God muſt be conſidered *with regard to himſelf* (let me ſay *Subjective*) which is his dealing with us according to the *Covenant of Faith* for Chriſts ſake, when he might deal with us according to the *Covenant of Nature* if he would: and *with regard to us* (let me ſay *Terminative*), or to the condition upon which he does ſo mercifully deal with us. As the *Love of God* is taken in Scripture both for his *Love towards us*, and our *Love of him*: So is the *Righteouſneſs of God* taken for both theſe, his dealing with us according to this covenant, and the condition on our part which

 he

he accepts. And hence is it, that when it is called the *Righteouſneſs of God* in one place, it is called the *Righteouſneſs of Faith* in another; and in a third, the *Righteouſneſs which is of God by Faith.* Now when it is our faith, our repentance, our new obedience which is the *Righteouſneſs of God* it ſelf (taken *Terminative*) whereby we are juſtified in oppoſition to the *works of the Law*, which no man can perform to be juſtified by them, and our Divines by *works*, will underſtand all good works, even this faith it ſelf as a work (as was ſaid), and our Evangelical obedience, inſomuch as when there is no righteouſneſs but what is *without us* can be oppoſed to theſe, it makes them by the *Righteouſneſs of God* to underſtand the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* who is God, and by faith, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt *apprehended by Faith*, which are in good earneſt conceptions ſo ſtrained: it appears (if I may uſe thoſe words in humility) how *being ignorant of the Righteouſneſs of God* in the right notion, *and going about to eſtabliſh* in a contrary vein to the *Jews* a righteouſneſs which is not their *own* but anothers, in the ſtead of that which it is not, they have not *ſubmitted* to the truth, in this Doctrin of Juſtification.

And herein now (farther) does appear the ground of reconciliation between the Papiſts and us upon the point. For when the one and the other (let their Books be conſulted) do go on the ſuppoſition that it is by the Law (the *Law of works*) that we are juſtified; this *Hypotheſis* being removed, the oppoſition on both ſides falls to the ground. That no man can bring or plead any ſuch righteouſneſs of his *own* before God as anſwers the Law, the Proteſtant muſt needs be in the right, and conſequently if it were by the Law that we muſt ſtand or fall at his Tribunal, there was a neceſſity for their bringing in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt made ours by faith (as they do) to juſtify us: but when indeed it is not ſo, when it is not (I ſay) by the *Law*, but by the *Covenant of Grace*, or by the *Goſpel* that we are to be judged, it is ſome wonder to me, this plain truth ſhould be no better underſtood. That Gods judging a man to have performed the condition of the covenant, is the accounting or declaring him righteous; and that Gods accounting a man righteous, is his juſtification. *Let no man deceive you* (ſays St *John*) *he that doth righteouſneſs, is righteous.* That righteouſneſs which makes a man righteous, and denominates him righteous, is that righteouſneſs which makes God account him righteous. But this is the righteouſneſs which he *does.* Note it, for it is expreſs. And

what

what righteouſneſs is that? Why, Not the righteouſneſs of *Works* which no man *does*: but the righteouſneſs of the *Goſpel*, that is in the ſtile of the other Apoſtle, a righteouſneſs *without works* (to wit, without the works of the Law, or perfect works, in the ſenſe he ſays alſo God juſtifies the *ungodly*) ſo that it is by *Grace*, while it is by this *Righteouſneſs* (which does and muſt lean on the merits of Chriſt no leſs than we ſay Faith it ſelf does) that we are juſtified and ſaved.

That the end of Chriſts coming into the world, of our Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, was that we ſhould be holy and righteous is ſaid ordinarily by Divines according to the Scriptures, but the right and plain underſtanding or reaſon of what they ſay, is not ſaid. *He hath choſen us in Chriſt that we ſhould be holy. He hath redeemed us from iniquity that we ſhould be a peculiar People. We are his workmanſhip created unto good works in (or through) Chriſt Jeſus.* Well! when God made man at firſt and gave him a Law, was it not that he ſhould live Holy? And when righteouſneſs then was the end of his *Creation* and the Law thereof, how is this ſaid to be the end of his *Redemption?* I anſwer therefore, Righteouſneſs (or Holineſs as they are one) we muſt know, does lye in a Conformity to the Law which God gives us. There is nothing elſe, and nothing leſs than this (the full performance of a Law given) that is Righteouſneſs. Upon this account, as ſoon as man once fell and broke the Law of his Creation, it was impoſſible he ſhould be righteous any more, unleſs there were a new Law brought in, in the performance whereof he might attain to that again which he had loſt. Now to this end was it, that Chriſt came and died, this was the very main buſineſs (*I count*) of his Redemption, even the procuring this new Law, or another Law with lower terms, which ſome men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and ſo have righteouſneſs, according to that Law, imputed to them for remiſſion, and life Eternal. Here you ſee what that righteouſneſs indeed is, which Chriſt is ſaid to *bring in*, and in what ſenſe he hath brought it in, or how ſuch Texts (as thoſe before) do attribute our Holineſs to him. The obedience of Chriſts life and death, we know, was fulfilled on earth, and of this he himſelf hath once ſaid, *It is finiſhed:* But the righteouſneſs he is ſaid to *bring in*, is called an *Everlaſting righteouſneſs*. And what then can that be, but the *righteouſneſs of the Goſpel*, which upon the ſame account alſo is called the *Everlaſting Goſpel?* That is, be-

cauſe it is by *this* righteouſneſs in oppoſition to that of the *Law* (or the righteouſneſs of *works*) that all men from the beginning of the world to the end of it, (and ſo is it to be accounted ever of force) do obtain everlaſting Salvation.

I know the great difficulty of this Doctrine will lye on the point of remiſſion. Our Divines do generally place juſtification in the remiſſion of Sin; ſo do the *Papiſts* (with ſomething elſe), and ſo have I my ſelf after others. Nevertheleſs, as I remember St *Auguſtine* in one place does find *fault* with this in *Pelagius*: ſo hath the perplexity of it of late lead me into the like thoughts. The Truth is, Pardon of Sin is a *benefit* unto which the juſtified perſon is adjudged, as eternal life is: but remiſſion of Sin muſt not be made the *formal reaſon* of juſtification. Our Divines might define juſtification to be an act of Grace whereby God gives us Eternal Life (or a right to it) as well as, *an act of grace whereby he pardons our ſins.* That act, that very only act wherein the form of Juſtification does lye, is Gods accounting or pronouncing a man righteous, and this is a forenſical act, according to Law, the Law, or Covenant of grace; Which Covenant promiſing *Forgiveneſs* and Life upon the performance of its Conditions, when a man hath performed them, he hath a right to thoſe benefits, and when God does declare or account that a man hath performed them (which is all one as to judge him righteous), theſe benefits flow to him from that Judgment (or are conferr'd on him by that act) as *Effects* of that cauſe, and conſequently cannot be the very act it ſelf, which is the *cauſe* of them.

To forgive a mans ſin, and declare him righteous, are two things inconſiſtent one with another in the ſame reſpect, and therefore when God pronounces a man juſt, it is according to the *Law of Faith*, and when he pardons his ſin, it is in reſpect to the *Law of works*. And how then can two acts incompatible but in divers reſpects be made to enter one and the ſame definition?

It is true as all agree, that there are no works that man does, or can do, able to make God any amends for our offences, ſo that remiſſion of ſin muſt be attributed altogether to the merits of Chriſt in regard to the attonement made. But we muſt diſtinguiſh of Remiſſion. Remiſſion is either *Conditional* and *Univerſal* as it lyes in the Covenant, and is the purchaſe of Chriſt: or *Actual*, as it lyes in the application thereof to *particular* perſons upon performance of the condition. When Divines do ſay we can do nothing

thing our ſelves for procuring reconciliation and remiſſion, it is to be underſtood of Conditional univerſal remiſſion. No mortal could do any thing toward the obtaining of that. *God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf not imputing their treſpaſſes.* But as for remiſſion Actual, that man muſt be blind who ſees not that God does every where require us to repent, believe, confeſs our faults, forſake them, do good works, forgive others, that we may have pardon, and be ſaved. Conditional pardon now is *antecedent* to mans juſtification, and contained in our Redemption. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveneſs of Sins.* Actual remiſſion is *ſubſequent* to juſtification, for we muſt be ſuppoſed firſt to have performed the condition and be pronounced righteous, and then pardoned. When there is no remiſſion than but what does either *go before*, or *follow* juſtification, it cannot be made the very act it ſelf of our juſtification.

There is one Text may be oppoſed. *Even as* David *alſo deſcribed the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without works, Saying, Bleſſed are they whoſe iniquities are forgiven.* It ſeems that the *Righteouſneſs* which *Paul* ſpeaks of *without works* in the one verſe, is deſcribed by *pardon* in the other. This I my ſelf have alledged, but upon farther conſideration I anſwer. *The man to whom* God imputeth righteouſneſs without works, or the *bleſſedneſs* of *that* man, is deſcribed: but we may ſuppoſe, not *the Righteouſneſs without works.* The ſcope of the Apoſtle is plainly to ſhew us only, that it is not by *works of the Law*, or ſuch works as would make the *reward of debt* and not of *grace* (as appears in the immediate verſes before) which are *perfect* works, that a man is juſtified. And he proves it by this argument, becauſe *the man is bleſſed whoſe ſins are forgiven*; that is as much as to ſay, not he who is without ſin, but he who hath ſin and it is forgiven. The man who is bleſſed is juſtified. But the man who is bleſſed hath ſin to be forgiven. Therefore the righteouſneſs which a man hath, or is imputed to him, is not a righteouſneſs according to the Law of works (which are perfect without ſin): but according to the Covenant of Grace (which are imperfect and need pardon). This I ſay is the ſcope of the place. *Not unto him that worketh* (that is performs the perfect work of the Law, for none do) *but unto him that believeth* (to wit, with a true faith) *on him that juſtifieth the ungodly*

ungodly (that is *legally* ungodly, or ungodly in reference to ſuch works) *his faith* (which being true, & working by love, makes him yet *Evangelically* godly) *is imputed to him for righteouſneſs*, that is, ſtands him in the ſtead as a perfect one would, through the acceptance of Grace. Gods *imputing Righteouſneſs* to a perſon is indeed a Phraſe ſignifying Gods accounting him righteous or juſtifying him: and the Apoſtle *proves* a man is juſtified *without works*, (that is perfect works) becauſe he hath *ſin to be covered*. I will yet repeat, The man to whom righteouſneſs is imputed without works, is *pardoned:* but it follows not, that this *Righteouſneſs without works* is *pardon*. To have righteouſneſs imputed to a man without works, is all one as to have faith imputed to him for righteouſneſs, ſo repentance or evangelical obedience, and that is not pardon, though theſe are never divided from the ſame ſubject. I will conclude therefore with that I have ſaid once before, and will ſay it again at my parting with the point, that it is ſtrange to me our proteſtant Divines ſhould be ſo offward to this clear Determination. To wit, God judges (and will judge) all men according to the *Goſpel*; Thoſe who perform the condition of it, he accounts or pronounces righteous; They whom he accounts righteous, are juſtified. I will add, That, the righteouſneſs of *Chriſt* which is the *meritoricus cauſe* of our juſtification without diſpute on all hands (that is the *impulſive procatartick cauſe*), which always comes under the *Efficient*, cannot for the ſame reaſon be the *Formal*, or *Material* cauſe of it. It is not the *infuſion of Righteouſneſs* with the *Papiſt*, which is our ſanctification; nor the *imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs* with the *Proteſtant*, which is not to be underſtood but *in genere cauſæ Efficientis*; nor *remiſſion of Sin*, with Proteſtant and Papiſt, which I have now bin diſproving: but the imputing to a Perſon his performance of the new covenant for righteouſneſs, or the accounting or pronouncing him righteous according to that covenant, is the *form*, formal Cauſe, or *formal Reaſon* of his Juſtification.

Do not think this ſtrange, Juſtification (I will grant) *virtually* or *Eminenter* (as *unum aggregatione*) contains in it many things, and ſo *remiſſion* among others (for we muſt find line to ſpeak as Divines uſe): but Juſtification *Formaliter* (as *unum ſimplex*) I ſay, is only Gods pronouncing us *Juſt* (or ſincere penitent believers), and *remiſſion* is a *benefit* which *in order of Nature* does *follow* the performance of that condition.

Out

Out of the Paper of *Perfection.*

BEfore I come to my preſent buſineſs, it is neceſſary that I ſet a *little* out of my way, which may elſe engender diſpute, in my laſt paper. It is about pardon of ſin, which I take to be the *effect*, not *formal Reaſon* of juſtification. *Pardon* (ſays Mr. Bradſhaw) *is neither the whole, nor any eſſential part of juſtification, but only a contingent effect of it.* Treat. of Juſt. c. 8. To reckon a man juſt, or to *impute to him righteouſneſs*, or deal with him as a righteous man, includes in it theſe two things, to lay nothing to his charge, and judge the reward due to him, that is (as to us) *Pardon*, and *Acceptance unto life.* Now theſe two things (I ſay) are included in it, but not as *Parts* of the thing, but as *Conſequents* of it, and that ſeparable from it. For ſuppoſe ſuch a man as had never ſinned, ſuppoſe *Adam* had not fell, he had been a righteous perſon, and God muſt have *accounted* him *righteous*, that is, *juſtified* him, but here could be no *Pardon*, ſo that it is manifeſt that pardon is ſeparable from Juſtification, in the *nature* thereof, though we *actually* that are ſinners, and are under wrath cannot be juſtified, but muſt be alſo pardoned. As for the reward of *Glory*, I cannot ſay if *Adam* had ſtood he ſhould have had it; he ſhould have been bleſſed in the happineſs he enjoyed, I can ſay no more. In like manner I may inſtance in the Angels, they never fell, are holy and *righteous*, and ſo *accounted* of God, but there is no pardon in *Heaven*, or any other reward, but what they had, and are to have for ever.

Δικαῶν then, To *juſtify*, is, I hold, in the nature, or *formal reaſon* of it, Δικαιον νομίξειν to account or declare one juſt. Whom ſoever the Scripture conſequently ſays was a juſt perſon, that perſon muſt be juſtified, for when the *Word* declares a man juſt, *God* does, whoſe word it is. Now look over the Scripture from *Geneſis* to the Revelation, you ſhall have no body called a righteous or juſt perſon but upon the account of his upright walking with God. For this walking, *Elizabeth* is called a *Righteous Perſon*; but *Magdalen* who was pardoned is called a *Sinner*. And that by *Juſtification* the Apoſtle underſtands Gods *accounting a man righteous*, and not *pardon* I offer (from what was hinted) this Argument. When he diſputes the queſtion whether we are juſtified by *faith*

or

or by *works*, he muſt underſtand the ſame thing by *Juſtification* while he aſcribes it to *faith*, and when he denys it to *works*. But the Apoſtle cannot underſtand *pardon* by juſtification when he ſays we are not *juſtified by works*, becauſe if we had thoſe works which he means, there were no ſin to pardon. The Apoſtle by *Works* underſtands ſuch as the Law requires to juſtification that is *perfect works*, ſuch as if one had them, would make the reward of *debt* and not of *grace*, and he ſays by the *Law* or by *Works* no man is juſtified, becauſe no man performs it, no man does them. This being premiſed then in the Apoſtles reſolution of the queſtion, it is apparent that he cannot underſtand *pardon* by *juſtification*, becauſe if he did ſo, there could be no queſtion about the matter. There can be no queſtion whether a man be *pardoned* who hath done thoſe works as have no *ſin* in them to *pardon*. I collect by the way, that to ſay a man is juſtified by *faith* and not *works*, is to ſay that God does *account a man righteous* (as he did *Abraham*) in regard to his *faith*, not deſerts. He does account and deal with him as ſuch, not upon his living according to the Law (*i. e.* Works) but his living according to the Goſpel. By *faith*; that is by his embracing Chriſtianity and living accordingly.

That a man muſt repent and believe (which is to perform the condition of the Covenant of Grace) in order of nature, before he be pardoned, is out of queſtion.

That God accounts the Perſon a Performer who is ſo, ariſes of neceſſity, becauſe his judgment is always according to Truth. Now when Gods accounting a man Righteous according to the Covenant (which is all one with his accounting him a penitent Believer, or performer of the condition) is *juſtifying* him as I ſay ſtill, and pardon follows this, it appears to me that Remiſſion muſt not be the *form* it ſelf, or *part*, but the *effect* of juſtification. Nevertheleſs to avoid needleſs difference with Brethren, I will diſtinguiſh, and compoſe the matter. It is true, Remiſſion is the effect, and no part of *this* juſtification: but there may be ſome *other* or further juſtification than this. Juſtification we agree to be a forenſical act oppoſed to the laying any thing to a mans charge whereby he may be condemned. *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that juſtifieth.* Now there is a double charge, the charge of the *Law*, that we are ſinners, and ſo condemnable for the violation of it: And the charge of the *Goſpel* that we have not per-

formed the remedying condition which God requires of us for the eſcaping that condemnation. Though it be an acquittal of us from the *latter* charge is that juſtification which every man is ſo much concerned to provide for, as that which depends upon the plea of what himſelf does, and the acquittal of us from the *former*, depends only on the plea of what Chriſt hath done for us, which can ſuffer no debate, I think, and ſo comes not into *Judgment*: yet will I not deny but Juſtification may be taken ſo *Comprehenſively* as to contain in it our diſcharge from the *Law* alſo. There is a juſtification then in regard to a *Particular* charge, the charge of the *one*; or *Univerſal* juſtification againſt all accuſation, or the charge of *Both*. As we muſt anſwer the charge of the Goſpel by denying that charge, and pleading our performance; we anſwer the charge of the Law by confeſſing it, and pleading Chriſts ſatisfaction; that is, we acknowledge that we are guilty and have deſerved Death, but yet that we are not condemnable becauſe we are pardoned by the Law of Grace, through the Meritorious Righteouſneſs and Sacrifice of Chriſt Jeſus, ſuppoſing ſuch a charge can find place before our Law-giver. Our Faith and Repentance is our Righteouſneſs in regard to the Goſpel; but pardon of ſin, together with this righteouſneſs, may go both into *Univerſal* juſtification. I cannot indeed but ſay ſtill, that *that* juſtification which is *Particular* in regard to the Goſpel-Charge, ſeems to me to be the juſtification which St *Paul* and *James* mainly intend, if not altogether; for when the one ſays we are *juſtified by Faith*, and the other *by works alſo*, and both prove it from one and the ſame Text, that *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*: I pray what elſe can juſtification be with either, but Gods imputing evangelical obedience to a perſon for Righteouſneſs; that is, Gods accounting of him righteous upon his believing, repenting, or performing the condition of the Goſpel? *Simpliciſſimum nobis videtur ſi dicamus, fidem juſtificare, quia credenti ſua fides imputetur ad juſtitiam. Fides autem ad juſtitiam imputari dicitur, quia Deus illum quia viva fide in Chriſtum credit pro juſto habet & reputat, cum a pœna peccati liberans, & ad vitam æternam acceptans, propter Chriſti mortem & obedientiam.* The Judicious *Le Blanc*.

That the Apoſtles *Righteouſneſs without Works*, and *Pardon*, is not the ſame (and conſequently that the one is a probation and not a deſcription of the other as I noted upon reflection), muſt be granted by thoſe who make both theſe to be parts of our juſti-

 ſication,

ſication, for ſuch is the nature of parts to be diverſe one from another. *Hæc eſt natura partium ut unum corpus diverſa componant.* Boethius. de Conſ. l. 3. p. 3. Again, *Quod a qualibet re diverſum eſt, id non eſt illud a quo intelligitur diverſum.* It muſt be alſo confeſſed by me, that the diverſity of *Two* things, as the cauſe and effect, does not hinder thoſe things to be parts of another *Third* which is the *compoſitum* of both; and conſequently that Gods juſtifying us by this *Righteouſneſs* (that is by *Faith* or Evangelical Obedience, *without the works of the Law*), and then Pardoning us, as the effect of that act, may both make up the *Compoſitum of Univerſal* Juſtification.

And now let me tell the Reader, there has paſſed two long private Letters apiece betwen Mr. *Baxter* and me about this point, and we have brought our conference to this cloſe: *God having for Chriſts merits and ſacrifice made a Grant of Pardon, Grace and Glory to all true Penitent Believers; we muſt firſt have the Particular* Juſtitia Conditionis, *or be juſtifiable againſt the charge of impenitency and unbelief, that ſo we may have right to Pardon, farther Grace and Glory, or* Jus ad impunitatem & ad Regnum cœlorum, *and be juſtifiable againſt the charge, That we are Sinners, Damnable, and have no right to Heaven.* There needs no more than theſe words (ſays Mr. *Baxter*) for a plain underſtanding the whole matter. And ſo (no Controverſie remaining here *in re*, but *in nomine* only) I will break off, and be concluded.

Out of the Paper called *Peaceable Diſquiſitions.*

HAving read Dr. *Owens* book of Juſtification, I am not ſatisfied with what he hath offered for the reconciliation of St *James* and *Paul* on that ſubject. This is the reaſon I ſuppoſe (that is, the moſt ſolid) why ſo many do chooſe here of late to go with the *Mediocrian*, or ſteer the *middle way*, in that point. I perceive that Dr *Tully* with our firſt Reformed Divines, and this excellent Doctor, are for diſtinguiſhing of *Faith*, and *Juſtification*, but will not let us, by no means, diſtinguiſh of *Works* for the reconciliation of the Apoſtles. I do wonder at this. The Apoſtle *James* and the Apoſtle *Paul* do both agree, that we are juſtified by Faith. The one ſays, *we conclude*

that

that a man is juſtified by Faith; and the other ſays alſo, it is *by Faith*: Their ſeeming difference is only about works, when one ſays *by Faith without Works*, and the other, *by Faith and Works alſo*. And how then comes it to paſs that we muſt not diſtinguiſh of *Works*, but of *Juſtification*, and *Faith*, to compoſe the difficulty?

I will offer the Doctor therefore here one Argument, under his favour, which ſhall be but one, and that not as others have, (ſo far as I know) for then it were like he had already weighed it. It is this: That Juſtification which St *Paul* ſpeaks of, is that Juſtification which we have in that Text of *Geneſis*, where it is ſaid, *And* Abraham *believed, and it was accounted to him for Righteouſneſs*. Or, That Juſtification *Paul* ſpeaks of, is that Imputation of Faith for righteouſneſs which is ſpoken of in that Text in *Geneſis*. But that Juſtification which St *James* ſpeaks of, is that Juſtification which we have in that Text in *Geneſis*; or, is that Imputation of Faith for Righteouſneſs, as is ſpoken of in that Text in *Geneſis*. *Therefore* St *Pauls* juſtification, and St *James* Juſtification are the ſame Juſtification. Again, That *Faith* which St *Paul* ſpeaks of, is the Faith that is ſpoken of in that Text in *Geneſis*, or the ſame Faith as was imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs in that place. But that Faith which St *James* ſpeaks of is the ſame Faith which is ſpoken of in that Text in *Geneſis*; or, the ſame Faith that was imputed to *Abraham* for righteouſneſs in that place. *Therefore* the faith that St *Paul* ſpeaks of, and the faith which St *James* ſpeaks of, is the ſame faith alſo. Now when the *Faith* is the *ſame*, and the *Juſtification* the *ſame*, we muſt diſtinguiſh of *Works* then out of queſtion, to reconcile theſe Scriptures.

Of Works then let us diſtinguiſh; and the diſtinction is this. There are Works which are inconſiſtent with Grace and Pardon, ſo that if we had them, we ſhould have no need of Chriſt's righteouſneſs or ſacrifice, but the doing of them would make the reward to be of debt, or make life to be due out of diſtrict juſtice, (*He that doeth them ſhall live in them*). That is, Works which the Law requires unto Juſtification. And theſe are the Works St *Paul* ſpeaks of, and the reaſons which he alledges why we are not juſtified by theſe Works is, becauſe no man hath them. This is that which he apparently urges (for he aſcends in his diſpute from the *Law of Moſes*, to the *Law of Nature*, which, concerns both Jew and *Gentile*) in his three firſt Chapters to the *Romans*; ſo that if a-

ny man be juſtified, it muſt be *without* them. Therefore we conclude (ſays he) that by faith *without them* (that is without having them) a man is juſtified. There are then Works alſo which are conſiſtent with Pardon & Mercy though we have them, ſo that when we have done theſe, we do need the righteouſneſs and ſatisfaction of our Redeemer to cover their imperfection, and for acceptation of our perſons, no leſs than if we had Faith alone without any, and theſe are Works of ſincerity required of us in the Goſpel.

It is no ways derogatory, I ſay, to Gods Grace and Chriſt's Merits, for a man to be juſtified by theſe works, any more than to be juſtified by Faith alone, in regard to Debt or Merit, upon which account St *Paul* excludes works in his diſputation. It is *of theſe Works* I muſt ſay, (as the Apoſtle ſays it is *of Faith*) *that it may be of Grace*. And theſe are the Works St *James* ſpeaks of, when he ſays, *By Faith and Works alſo*; that is all one as by a *Faith working by Love*, in *Pauls* words otherwhere. And the being juſtified by *Faith working by Love*, or by a Faith productive of Works, or by theſe *Works and Faith* alſo (which being ſuch Works as fall ſhort of the Law, and do need grace and forgiveneſs for their acceptation with God) is all one with St *Pauls* by Faith *without works of the Law*, or without ſuch as the Law requires unto juſtification. Thus are *Paul* and *James* reconciled, and ſo you find it in my *Middle* Papers.

I will Advance hence then my former Argument. That juſtification by Faith without works which St *Paul* ſpeaks of, is that Juſtification, or that Imputation of *Abrahams* Faith for righteouſneſs, which is ſpoken of in that Text in *Geneſis*. But that juſtification by Works and Faith alſo, which St *James* ſpeaks of, is that Juſtification or that Imputation of *Abrahams* faith for righteouſneſs, which is ſpoken of in that Text in *Geneſis*. *Therefore* St *Pauls* juſtification by faith without works, and St *James* juſtification by faith and works alſo, or *by works and not by faith only*, is the ſame in the two Apoſtles.

The *medium* upon which all three Syllogiſms depend, is the Apoſtles citing the ſame Text, both of them, for that which either of them aſſert, while one ſays *by faith without works*, and the other *by works and not by faith only*. The *major* and *minor* therefore in all three are undeniable; and in the *Concluſion* of the *laſt*, I am ſure the Doctor and I ſhall agree together.

To

To Mr. *Williams.*

THere was a Letter I wrote to you upon the coming out of your laſt Book, a Coppy whereof being taken by the hand that carried it to the Poſt, and given me again newly to Peruſe, I will put it to the end of theſe Papers, with the liberty of amplification.

To be made Righteous by Chriſts Obedience, is, ſay you, 1. *To be made free from Condemnation, and to be Intituled to Eternal Life.* 2. *To be be made Holy through the Spirit or infuſed righteouſneſs, whereby we believe, repent, and perform the condition for obtaining that right.* I uſe not your very words, the ſenſe being one.

That by Chriſts Righteouſneſs, we are made Righteous ſo as to be freed from condemnation, is what is generally received; but to be made righteous by his obedience ſo as to be regenerated by it, is diſputable, if true; or to have Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to us for juſtification, is what we ſay commonly: but to have it imputed to us for Converſion, Regeneration, Sanctification, is odd, and needs explanation.

Your meaning is, Jeſus Chriſt by what he hath done and ſuffered for us, hath purchaſed for the Elect, Faith, Repentance, or our Infuſed righteouſneſs, as well as Pardon and Life, and ſo by his obedience we are made Evangelically righteous as well as juſtified. But this is a Scheme I look on as incongruous with free reaſon (though our Divines accuſtom themſelves to ſay ſo), becauſe there goes to Mans Salvation more, I hope than Chriſts redemption. There is *Election* hath its part, and *Redemption* its part: There is the hand of the *Father* in it, the work of the *Son*, and the operation of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and theſe parts muſt not be confounded. God loves the World and gives his Son: Chriſt comes, and by his death procures redemption for all; ſo that upon condition of their faith they may be ſaved: The Holy Ghoſt works that faith or condition in the Elect, and ſo they are ſaved.

The Work of Redemption reaches no farther than to free us from the Law or Condemnation upon condition; for Redemption is but Redemption, and *Univerſal*, and muſt not be conſequently one thing for the *World*, and another for the *Elect*. Redemption

demption having done its part; that is, procured Salvation unto all on condition: Election now does its part in providing for ſome the Condition. Our Divines are ſtill ſaying indeed, that Chriſts Redemption muſt not be held ſuch, as that when the work is done it might be poſſible that none yet might be ſaved, & ſo he dye in vain; but it is really an idle complaint, for Election takes care of that. To wit, I ſay, when Redemption hath done its work, rendring all men Salvable on condition, This takes care that there are ſome ſhall be ſure to perform that Condition (Believe, Repent, Perſevere) and be ſaved. And ſo we give to each of them their own proper work in the Oeconomy of our Salvation. The firſt *Grace* (it lyes in my thoughts), as Chriſt himſelf, is given freely, and not bought for any; and the condition in the ſpring, and the firſt grace being one, though Chriſt hath not purchaſed the Condition for the Elect (which as the *immediate* fruit of Redemption he hath not), it does not lye on their own *free will* for all that.

Let us take heed (as my ſelf have it otherwhere) how we order our conceptions in the matter of our Salvation, that we ſet not God aſide as *Rector* or *Lord*, in it. We muſt not advance and juſtifie his *Rectorſhip* ſo as to exclude his *Lordſhip*; nor ſo advance and juſtifie his *Lordſhip* as to exclude his *Rectorſhip* in the buſineſs. On one hand, thoſe Perſons that hold Chriſt dyed for all, procuring Salvation on Condition, but leave the Condition on mans free will (or on a co-operating with general Grace, procured as ſome ſay, thereby), they do excellently illuſtrate Gods *Rectorſhip*, and juſtifie him in dealing with us, according to *Goſpel-Law*, but they exclude his *Lordſhip*: As on the other hand, they that hold Chriſt dyed only for the *Elect*, purchaſing the *Condition* as well as the *Benefit*, and that there is no *Covenant* but what is *Abſolute*; they do excellently advance Gods *Lordſhip*, but in effect do exclude his *Rectorſhip* from having a hand in *Man's Salvation*. But as for thoſe Perſons now that hold, Chriſt hath dyed for *All*, in purchaſing pardon and ſalvation on *Condition*; but that the Condition flows not from the Power or Co-operation of *Man's free will*, nor *directly* from *Chriſts purchaſe*, but from *Election*; theſe do moſt manifeſtly give God his glory, both as *Rector* and *Lord*; while they make him as *Lord* to give the *Condition* to his *Elect*, and as *Rector* to judge of *them*, as of all the *World*, according to that *Condition*.

For

For your former way of being made righteous, by Gods giving a believer (as you ſay) right to pardon and acceptance with God unto life, which is *by imputing to us Chriſts righteouſneſs in the fruit and effects*, I pray why did you not ſtick to that? What need any fear or vindication to make you adde that *Beſides thoſe effects being made ours, the very righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to believers?* When theſe good men ſay, that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed, they underſtand that Chriſt in *Law-ſenſe*, or in the *perſon* of the *elect*, did ſatisfy the penalty of the *law*, and perfectly obeyed it, ſo that the believer himſelf may be ſaid, and reckoned of God to have made ſatisfaction, and obeyed in his *ſurety*, whereby a right to pardon, and life is his, no leſs than if he had done it himſelf. What ſay you now to them? You and we all do grant, that what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered for us, is not only *bono noſtro*, but *loco noſtro*; that is, in our ſtead, ſo far, that we ſhall have the benefit or the fruit of it all one as if we had ſatisfied and obeyed our ſelves; If beſides theſe fruits or effects, Chriſts righteouſneſs is made ours, or imputed in any further ſenſe than ſo, it lyes upon you to ſhew in what, and what difference there is (even ſuch as you are able to make out for a plain man to underſtand) betweeen you and them; that is, the difference between Chriſts having ſatisfied and obeyed the Law for our ſakes, ſo as to be *in our ſtead*, and yet not ſo as we may be reckoned of God, in *Law-ſenſe*, as if *our ſelves* had *performed* it; which is indeed to be as righteous even in regard to the Law of Works, as our *ſurety*; for in that righteouſneſs which is the *ſame*, there can be neither *inequality*, or *compariſon*. I ſee not but if you grant the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be imputed to us any otherwiſe or more than in its *effects*, it muſt needs come at laſt to no leſs than this; and then you boggle, and have yeilded your cauſe to your Adverſary.

Chriſt's righteouſneſs (ſay you) *may be conſidered as the full performance of the conditions of the Covenant of Redemption, which included a full conformity to the law of works: and an adjudged right to the promiſed reward for his performance of theſe conditions. Now both theſe are imputed to a believer on conſideration of Gods giving a believer a right to pardon and life.* By theſe words I think you intended the explanation of your notion; but when you know that a right to pardon and life (which is the gift of God we own through Chriſts merits) is a *fruit* and *effect* of Chriſts righteouſneſs, how

can

can the *full performance* you mention, which is *Christ's Righteousness it self*, be given to any under the consideration of that which is an *effect* thereof? It is imputed, or given, in regard to its Effects: but how *besides* is it given? I deny, *that the full performance of the Covenant of Redemption* can be imputed (with this *Besides*) to any mortal, it being proper to Christ, and belonging to him only: and consequently there is nothing in our behalf but the reward promised (that is a right to pardon, and life in the main) that can be given the believer, nor can his righteousness be imputed to any, but in regard to the *benefit* only.

After this, the great point to be debated with Mr. *M.* that serious Antagonist, should be about the *Righteousness of God*, what the Apostles does indeed mean by *that*. You have not seen five sheets of mine printed long since, nor Mr. *Clarks* unprinted late book. If you had, or have, or have not, who knows, God only knows, whither you being here so mealy mouth'd, and not *speaking out*, which I think you ought, as for the truth, when the time so much requires it, did give him just cause to let you fall into that exasperation, and offence of these Brethren which you sought *thereby* to avoid. Whereas let me tell you, when I meeting once with Dr. *Owen*, and Sir *Charles Wolesley* together, and they were speaking for the Doctrin of Justification, especially Sir *Charles*, very keenly, I plainly told them, that I was of another judgment, which I shewed them in putting then out these sheets here reprinted. Sir *Charles* told me afterwards, he had read them twenty times over, and turning *Mediocrian* himself, he wrote his book our way, on this Subject, which you having seen, can't be excused: The Doctor Candidly signifyed to me that he could bear with *me* (or such as me) in the difference; and (though one chapter in my *Disquisitions* is namedly against him) he never shewed any Offence, or offered any Vindication.

Well! Let us consult hereupon what is that *righteousness of God*, St *Paul* speaks of *Rom.* 1. 17. *Rom.* 3. 21, 26. 2 *Cor.* 1. 21. *Phil.* 3. 9. which he calls so; GOD's righteousness, the righteousness of *faith*, that which is *through the faith of Christ*, the righteousness *which is of God by faith*, in opposition to *works* in the point of Justification? Is it the righteousness of *Christ*, who is *God*, and therefore called *the righteousness of God?* I am perswaded that this is a first thought, so shallow, that it must be short. What then indeed is it? This Righteousness of God, is *that way*

and

and method of becoming righteous, which is of Gods inſtitution. So Mr. *Clark* before mentioned in his *Annotations*, on *Rom.* 1. 17. That is, not the righteouſneſs *of* Chriſt, but that righteouſneſs *through* Chriſt (accepted as ſuch through him), which is ordained of God, and ſo promulgated, in the Goſpel. But what *Way and Method* is that?

When God made man, we muſt conceive he had in his proſpect what to do with him, and that was to glorify himſelf in ſaving him. There was two ways to do this, either by the way of *Works*, or *Grace*. Man was created with an Original Righteouſneſs, and what was *Original* muſt be *Natural*, and if he had ſtood, he muſt according to *Nature* have been righteous, and all his poſterity, and the reward then (as it is reckoned by the Apoſtle) would have been of *debt* or *merit*, and not of grace. God hereby ſhould have glorifyed his *juſtice* and *goodneſs* in ſaving man, but he ſhould have ſhewen no *mercy*, nor man have any need of it; no, nor any need of a Saviour, or Redemption, or the holy Spirits operation: that is, of that grace which is medicinal, or habitual grace; for I ſay, if he had an original righteouſneſs, he had no need of the infuſion of a new, to heal original corruption. He would have been ſaved by works proceeding from nature, *Ex regula, & viribus Naturæ*, and not from grace or the ſpirit, and have needed none of that *grace* neither which is *favour*, but only Gods *juſtice* to have dealt with him according to that law of innocency, which he had performed. God therefore did not chooſe this way, that man ſhould be ſaved by a righteouſneſs of his own according to *nature*; but by the way of *grace*, and works proceeding from grace, or the Holy Spirit, and not of himſelf; and that is, by a righteouſneſs, which is of God by faith. *For by grace are you ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt:* That is, as much as to ſay, not by a righteouſneſs of your own contriving, meriting or effecting, but of Gods own contrivance, who hath choſen this way rather than that of works, that none may aſcribe that to themſelves, which is due only to God. *Not by works of righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of water, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt.* Note, here is the righteouſneſs we have done, and the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo oppoſed as that we are ſaved by that righteouſneſs, which is of *God*, and of Gods ſpirit, and not by that which is our *own*. How is that? Why, *they being ignorant of Gods righte-*

ouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own, have not ſubmitted to that, which ſhould have ſaved them. The performance of the Law of *Moſes*, was the *Jews* righteouſneſs (for God ſays, *this ſhall be your righteouſneſs*), and the performance of the Law of Nature, or Covenant of works, is all *mankinds* righteouſneſs; and when neither *Jew* could perform the one, and no mortal but Chriſt, the other; there are none can be ſaved by the righteouſneſs of their *own*, but it muſt be by *another* righteouſneſs called by the Apoſtle, the *Righteouſneſs of God*. But now *the righteouſneſs of God without the law is manifeſt, being witneſſed by the law and Prophets, even the righteouſneſs of God, which is by the faith of Jeſus Chriſt*. Here is a righteouſneſs that was ever on foot in the world (or none elſe could have been ſaved) but now revealed by the Goſpel, which is the righteouſneſs that ſaves us in oppoſition to the righteouſneſs of the law, or of works, even the righteouſneſs of Faith; that is, a righteouſneſs according to the Law of Grace, or Covenant of Grace, which Chriſt hath procured for us by his Blood. Hence do we read, it is ſaid, of Chriſt in *Daniel*, that as he ſhould make *reconciliation for iniquity*, ſo he ſhould bring in an *everlaſting righteouſneſs*; that is, he ſhould by his death procure a Covenant, or Law of Grace; by our performance whereof (*without the Law*) we are righteous, and muſt be juſtified and ſaved. 'Tis that is this righteouſneſs. If Chriſt had not procured for us this new law, there could have been no righteouſneſs in the earth; for the law of innocency no man can perform, and therefore hath he by procuring this new Covenant, brought in a righteouſneſs into the world; and that which is the abiding righteouſneſs, the righteouſneſs of this Covenant, whereby all are ſaved, that have, or ever ſhall be ſaved. Now when we have here a righteouſneſs which lyes in performance of the Law of Grace, purchaſed for us by Chriſt, and wrought in us by the Spirit of Grace (for the Spirit we muſt know is not given to perform the law of *works*, but *this* law) we do ſee what does belong to this *way* of grace, which God hath choſen to ſave man by. This *way of Grace* does contain in it the giving Chriſt, the Redemption we have by him, our reconciliation with God, pardon of ſin, the Covenant it ſelf, and the diſpenſation of the ſpirit, or his grace for performing the condition of it. All this and more hangs together, ſo that when we ſay it is not by *works*, but by *grace*, that we are ſaved, it is all one as to ſay, it is not by perfect works, but an Evangelical righteouſneſs,

neſs, by Mercy, by Pardon, by Chriſt. See what this *Righteouſneſs of God* comes to in its right and full definition.

And what now is the *Law of Grace* which we ſo often mention, and by the way, what the *Election of Grace?* From that is ſaid, I am often prone to think, that the Election of Grace is really at the bottom nothing but this; to wit, Gods chuſing this *way* and *method*, the method and way of *Grace*, and not of *Works*, in the ſaving of Man. A *choice* of the *way* of ſaving Men, rather than of *whom* he ſaves. I do not lay down this as my opinion, but offer it to conſideration. *He hath choſen us in Chriſt* (ſays the Apoſtle) *before the foundation of the World.* Election then is *in Chriſt*. How that is, according to the common no- of Election, is over-hard to conceive: but take it in this notion, and here is even day-light. For the *Law of Grace*, there is no ſuch kind of difficulty, it is all one with the *Goſpel*. A Law is the declaration of the will of the Law-giver; and this Law of Grace then, or the Goſpel (which I ſay are one) is the declaration of this *Way* and *Method* that God hath choſe for Man's *Salvation.*

God was in Chriſt (ſays the Text) *reconciling the world to himſelf, not imputing their treſpaſſes, and hath committed to us the Word of Reconciliation.* That *Word* is the *Goſpel*, declaring to the world this reconciliation or pardon which Chriſt hath purchaſed for it. The pardon is general, and a ſtanding pardon paſſed in Heaven as a pardon that paſſes in Parliament. An Act of Grace (for this is the conception we muſt have of it) paſſes the Houſes and King, the people do nothing toward the obtaining of it, and it is general: nevertheleſs, if any come to have the benefit of this pardon, he muſt look into the Act, and ſee how it runs; he muſt be qualified according to the Act, or he loſes the benefit. It is verily ſo in this Act of Grace, or Pardon, for mankind. It is an Act of Grace, I ſay, perfectly free to man. No one can do any thing for the attoning God, or meriting it from Him. It is all from the love of the Father, in ſending his Son, and his Son fulfilling the Law, and Suffering for us; that it is granted, and in *this ſenſe* (as to the pardon in general, and the means procuring it) thoſe Divines that ſay the Covenant of Grace is without conditions, may be juſtified: When yet if any come in particular for the benefit of this *Pardon, Act of Grace, Grant, Law, Covenant, Teſtament* (for this *Grant* of Pardon ob-

tained by Christ, the *Covenant* or *Testament* of Christ, which is his *will*, bequeathing what he hath purchased upon his own Terms, are all we know but the same thing), he must read the *Act*, and see how it is passed; or read over the *Will*, and see how it is *made*, he must go to the *Rowl*, which is the Word of God (it was decreed from Eternity, it passed at Christ's death, it was inrolled in Gods Word, and promulgated by the Ministers of it), and there he will find that God requires of every man to Believe, Repent, and walk Sincerely before him, in order to have the benefit; which if he do not, he is to have none by it; so that in this, which is the *common sense*, every one must see that the Covenant hath conditions. The Pardon belongs to all, and Christ dyed for all: but the benefit of the pardon, and of Christ's death, comes only to his *Sheep* that *Hear his voice* and believe in him. This states that must agitated point of *Redemption*; which I think fit, with another passage before, to borrow out of a Paper of mine, printed much later than my former *Middle way Papers*, without the Authors name to it; it was Entituled, *A Pacifick Paper touching the Universality of Redemption, the conditionality of the Covenant of Grace, and our freedome from the Law of Works*. I did not put in either passage in the Original I wrote to you, for, you having seen that, it was needless to you: but now I print it, it is needful for others. For when my aim is only at the investigation of Light or Truth, and the publick profit; I am never out of my way, so long, as I am in the middle way still in these Determinations.

One thing yet I must add, that I am, and cannot but be offended much in my mind, that when it pleased God to raise up such a Man as Mr *Baxter* (whose constant Piety and Integrity towards him, and Profoundness in Divinity, hath scarce a parallel amongst the chiefest Divines, *English* or *Out-landish*, who have preceded him) to make the reconciling our Protestant differences, (those about the *Five-Points*, and this about *Justification*, and the like) his very business, so as that he hath brought them to appear either as good as none at all, or so small and little as to be tolerable: There is a Company of our *Brethren* at present, that are for reviving and making *so much* again of them, as if they sought to bury that peace he sought, and light he hath offered, and Books, with his Person; regarding him no more than one that had never been, or had wrote nothing about these matters;

ters; which they do alſo with a ſpirit ſo partial towards our firſt REFORMERS, becauſe ſuch, as to be *pertinacious* even in their *aberrations*. I am (I ſay) offended at this, and ſo far indeed of another mind, that let *Martin Luther* ſay what he will, and *John Calvin* ſay what he will; nay, the Aſſembly of Divines, which is more, in their grave *Confeſſions* and *Catechiſms*: and more than that, let the *Synod of Dort* alſo ſay what it will, they are but men, and I will not Captivate my Underſtanding to any of them; For this I am ſure, that all of them, and I, are out ſtill in one thing or other, and will be ſo to the end of the World.

Your loving Friend,

J. H.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 4. Line 9. for *tam.* r. tum. p. 26. l. 35. f. *de.* r. di. p. 30. l. 29. *him* is wanting. r. *make* him *a ſinner*. p. 33. l. 22. f. *of* r. or. p. 47. l. 26. f. *νομιξειν* r. *νομίζειν*. p. 49. l. 34. f. *quis* r. qui.

There was Four Papers of the Authors, called the *Middle Way*; whereof this of *Juſtification* being Sold off, the reſt could not be put together: But this being Reprinted, theſe Four Papers, with that of *Peaceable Diſquiſitions*, may be had Bound in one Book, according to the Advertiſement in the *Catalogue* of Books enſuing.

T. P.

A Letter to the Non-conformiſt Miniſters Aſſembled for Concord about ſome Matters of *Opinion*, in the Year, 1694.

Reverend Brethren!

IT has been the uſe of moſt Churches, where there hath been difference of Judgment, to meet together, and draw up certain Theſes, *or Poſitions in that Latitude of* Words *as they may all Subſcribe them; and this they call Union. But ſuch a Union is no Union, where the* Tongue *is* one, *and* Mind cloven. *I do therefore humbly crave leave (who am near 74. Years of age) to put in my Advice among you; which is, that you will not be forward (unleſs there were ſomething of the Magiſtrates Authority in the caſe) to the making any Union as to points of Doctrin, but this only; A Union in Forbearing, and Bearing with one another, as to all things, but what is of neceſſity to Salvation.* In neceſſariis Unitas, in non neceſſariis Libertas. 1 *Cor.* 8. 2.

Your Brother and Fellow-Servant
in the Miniſtry,

John Pumfrey.

Books Printed for *Tho. Parkhurſt* at the Bible and Three Crowns in *Cheap-ſide.*

Mediocria: Or, The moſt natural and plain Underſtanding, according to the Scripture of the great Doctrines of Election, Redemption, Juſtification, the Covenants, the Law and Goſpel, and of Perfection. With indifferency between *Arminian* and *Calviniſt: Proteſtant* and *Papiſt: Antinomian* and *Legaliſt:* The *Orthodox* and *Quaker.*

By this Author.

Free Juſtification by Chriſt; Written firſt in Latine, by *John Fox*, Author of the Book of Martyrs, againſt *Oſorius:* And now Tranſlated into Engliſh, for the Benefit of thoſe who love their own Souls, and would not be miſtaken in ſo great a point.

A Paraphraſe on the New Teſtament, with Notes Doctrinal and Practical, by plainneſs and brevity, fitted for the uſe of Religious Families in their dayly reading the Scriptures, and of the younger and poorer ſort of Schollers and Miniſters, who want fuller Helps, with an Advertiſement of the difficulties in the *Revelations.* By the late Reverend Divine Mr. *Rich. Baxter:* The 2d. edition correctd. To which is added, Mr. *Baxter*'s account of his Notes on ſome particular Texts. For which he was Impriſoned.

Family-Hymns, gathered (moſtly) out of the beſt Tranſlations of *David*'s Pſalms. By Mr. *Matthew Henry*, Miniſter in *Cheſter.*

The Churches Triumph over Death. At a Funeral Sermon, preached upon the death of Mr. *Robert Fleming*, late Paſtor of a Church in *Rotterdam.* By *Dan. Burgeſs.*

The Cauſe and Cure of Strife and Diviſions: Being the ſubſtance of two Sermons, preached *March* 12, and 26. By *Richard Mayo*, Miniſter of the Goſpel.